The University of Chicago

EUCHARISTIC TRADITION IN THE *PERLESVAUS*

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
1935

By
WILLIAM J. ROACH

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie
Vol. LIX (I), January, 1939

The University of Chicago

EUCHARISTIC TRADITION IN THE *PERLESVAUS*

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
1935

By
WILLIAM J. ROACH

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie
Vol. LIX (I), January, 1939

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

SONDERABDRUCK AUS
ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ROMANISCHE PHILOLOGIE
BAND LIX / HEFT 1

Eucharistic Tradition in the *Perlesvaus*.

It has been suggested by a number of critics that the doctrine of the Eucharist, and the various controversies over it, may have been of some significance in the development of the Grail legend[1]. The association of the Grail with the Eucharist seems obvious enough in some works such as the *Perlesvaus* and the metrical *Joseph* of Robert de Boron, but such an association is not at all clear in the *Conte del graal* of Chrétien de Troyes[2]. Indeed, it is practically useless to look for a direct reflection of the more subtle and abstruse doctrines of the Church in most of the vernacular narrative literature of the Middle Ages, except of course in the *Queste del saint Graal*, which is strikingly dissimilar in tone, style, and technique from all the other romances[3]. In most of them, and in the verse romances particularly, there is little direct evidence of any but the most fundamental and simply-phrased 'doctrines' properly so-called, and there are reflected in most Old French narrative works only those religious ceremonies and doctrines which had become part of the everyday life of the people and were so familiar to both the authors and their readers as to be accepted almost without thought of their content or significance[4]. On the other hand, a few of the prose romances contain episodes which, though they reflect little of the personal point of view of the authors, yet reveal a contact with certain currents of pious tradition which must be analyzed and clarified if we are to understand the works in relation to their backgrounds[5]. It is

---

[1] J. D. Bruce, *The Evolution of Arthurian Romance* (Göttingen and Baltimore 1923), I, 241 ff.; Lizette A. Fisher, *The Mystic Vision in the Grail Legend and in the Divine Comedy* (New York 1917), pp. 9 ff.; Peter Browe, *Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter* (München 1933), pp. 20 and 34; Adolph Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Liturgie und des religiösen Volkslebens* (Freiburg i. B. 1902), pp. 103—104.

[2] Cf. R. Heinzel, 'Über die französischen Gralromane', *Denkschriften der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Phil.-Hist. Kl.), XL (1891), Abhandlung III, pp. 7—9; and A. Hilka, edition of Chrétien's *Conte del graal* (Halle 1932), note to vs. 6422).

[3] Cf. A. Pauphilet, *Etudes sur la Queste del saint Graal* (Paris 1921), pp. 13, 27—33.

[4] Pauphilet, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[5] E. Gilson's article on 'La Mystique de la grâce dans la *Queste del saint Graal*', *Romania*, LI (1925), 321—347, has cast a great deal of light on the significance of the doctrine of grace in the treatment of both characters and action in the *Queste*.

the purpose of this study to consider the treatment and presentation of a special type of miracle-story relating to the Eucharist in one of the earliest prose Grail romances, the *Perlesvaus*. The author of this work was a conscious artist, and an examination of the background of a motif which he employed with particular success will, it is hoped, contribute to our understanding of the literary technique of a medieval author.

In the first 'branch' of the *Perlesvaus*, King Arthur, who has fallen into a state of mind that impedes his doing the good deeds for which he had become famous, is exhorted by Queen Guenevere to make a pilgrimage to the Chapel of Saint Austin, where he will recover his 'talent de bien fere' (93)[1]. When he arrives there after a number of adventures, he finds that an invisible force prevents him from entering the Chapel (286—287), though he can see through the door that the hermit is beginning Mass. At the right side of the hermit is 'le plus bel enfant que nus veïst onques' (291), clothed in an alb, with a golden crown on its head 'carchiee de pierres precieuses, qui rendoient molt grant clarté'. At the left of the hermit is 'une dame si bele que totes les biautez du monde ne se porroient conparer a sa biauté' (294—295). When the hermit has finished his *Confiteor*, the lady takes her son and goes to sit at the right side of the altar, 'desus une chaiere molt riche'. Arthur wonders that she calls the child 'son pere e son fill' (301). A ray of light comes through a window and falls upon the altar. The King hears the responses of angels as the hermit chants the Mass. At the Offertory[2] 'la dame prist son enfant e l'ofri as mains au saint ermite' (307—308), and Arthur is astonished that the hermit did not wash his hands when he received the offering: 'Mes il ne s'en deüst pas merveillier s'il seüst l'achoison, car si halte offrande ne li fust pas oferte s'il n'eüst les mains netes, e le cors, de toz vices'. Then the hermit 'commença son sacrement', and King Arthur kneels down outside the Chapel. After the Preface[3] the King looks again toward the altar 'e li sanbla que li sainz hermites tenist entre ses mains .i. home, sanglant o costé, e sanglant es paumes e es piez, e coroné d'espines' (315—317). After he has looked at the figure for a while, it seems to disappear. He feels pity in his heart, and tears come to his eyes. When he looks again toward the altar — presumably after the Communion — thinking to see 'l'umaine figure', it has changed into the form of the child that he had seen before. When the Mass is finished, the voice of an angel says 'Ite missa est', and the child and its mother disappear from the Chapel with 'la graigneur con-

[1] References are to the line numbers of the edition by W. A. Nitze and T. A. Jenkins, *Le Haut Livre du Graal, Perlesvaus*, 2 vols. (Chicago 1932—1937).

[2] 'qant li sainz Evangiles fu liz' (306—307).

[3] 'aprés le preface' (315) — probably the time of the Consecration is meant.

peignie e a la plus bele que nus eüst onques veüe' (323). The ray of light also disappears from the window, and the hermit tells the King that he may enter.

Arthur's visit to Saint Austin's Chapel is an independent and almost extraneous episode in the romance. It serves as the central scene of the first 'branch', which constitutes the introduction to the work. In a story as closely-knit as the *Perlesvaus*, in which few incidents are related in their entirety and brought immediately to a logical conclusion the first time they are mentioned, it is surprising to find Arthur's vision never again explicitly alluded to in the course of the work[1]. Probably we may assume that, since the author has here departed from his usual practise, it is because he believed Arthur's vision to have sufficient intrinsic and artistic merit as an edifying picture to permit it to stand alone.

Eucharistic visions, as is well known, are much older than the early thirteenth century when the *Perlesvaus* was written. In various forms they may be said to go back to patristic times. The usual purpose of the authors of the Latin stories similar to the *Perlesvaus* tale is to describe (*a*) the punishment of those who receive or treat the Eucharist irreverently, (*b*) the reward or consolation of a faithful believer, (*c*) the strengthening of the faith of a doubter[2]. However, a study of the development of such stories can be more conveniently and comprehensibly presented in approximately chronological order than according to their purpose.

The earliest stories relating to the miraculous powers of the consecrated host are much simpler in form and presentation than the elaborately described scene in the *Perlesvaus*, which is the product of a long evolution in both the technique and purpose of the stories. Cyprian, in his *Liber de lapsis*, chaps. xxiv-xxvi[3], seems to be the first who mentions any transformation of the Eucharistic species. His stories, which are very tersely related, deal only with the punishment of those who receive the Eucharist unworthily ('non cibum sed gladium sibi sumens' [xxvi]), and who are punished by physical suffering when 'in corpore atque ore violato eucharistia permanere non potuit' (xxv). He claims to have been an eye-witness of some

---

[1] On the structure of the *Perlesvaus*, see Nitze and Jenkins, *op. cit.*, II, chap. v. The only subsequent reference to Arthur's visit to Saint Austin's Chapel is at line 926, where a damsel tells Gauvain: 'Je haï trop .i. chevalier, por amor de lui [Arthur], qui me trova vers la chapele Saint Augustin.' Further evidence of the independence of Branch I from the rest of the *Perlesvaus* is the fact that it serves equally well (with a few changes of proper names) as an introduction to the Vulgate *Queste* in two MSS; cf. Nitze and Jenkins, *op. cit.*, I, 10–12,

[2] On the purpose of these stories, see further Franz Schmid, 'Die eucharistischen Wundererscheinungen im Lichte der Dogmatik', *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, XXVI (1902), 494ff.

[3] Ed. Joseph Martin (Bonn 1930: 'Florilegium patristicum, XXI'), pp. 35–38; also *PL*, IV, 498–501.

of the miracles which he describes ('Praesente ac teste me ipso accipite quid evenerit' [xxv]), but he does not say so specifically for his one case of transformation of the species: 'et qui alius et ipse maculatus sacrificio a sacerdote celebrato partem cum ceteris ausus est latenter accipere, sanctum Domini edere et contrectare non potuit, cinerem ferre se apertis manibus invenit' (xxvi)[1].

Optatus Afer, in his *De schismate Donatistarum*, II, xix, relates a story of the punishment of certain heretics who wished to desecrate the host by giving it to dogs, but 'iidem canes accensi rabie, ipsos dominos suos, quasi latrones, sancti corporis reos, dente vindice tamquam ignotos et inimicos laniaverunt[2]'.

In the *Historia Monachorum*, written by Rufinus of Aquileia between 402 and 410[3], is a story concerning a vision of Saint Macarius, who saw devils 'quasi parvulos quosdam puerulos Aethiopes tetros' present when the monks were receiving communion:

> Ubi porrexissent ad suscipiendum palmas, in nonnullorum manibus praevenientes Aethiopes, carbones deponere, Corpus autem, quod tradi Sacerdotis manibus videbatur, redire ad altare; aliis vero quos meliorum merita juvabant, extendentibus manus ad altare, longe recedere daemones, et cum ingenti metu refugere; Angelum enim Domini assistere cernebat altari, qui cum sacerdotis manu suam quoque manum in Sacramentorum distributione superponeret[4].

The first example of the transformation of the Eucharistic species into a living being occurs in the *Vita Sancti Basilii*, which, like the *Historia Monachorum*, forms part of the *Vitae Patrum*. This collection became very widely disseminated in the later Middle Ages, and the legend of Basil and the Jew was much imitated by

---

[1] Peter Browe, 'Die scholastische Theorie der eucharistischen Verwandlungswunder', *Theologische Quartalschrift*, CX (1929), 306, says that this type of miracle does not recur in the Middle Ages. Undoubtedly he means that it does not recur independently, because the vision of St. Macarius (discussed below) is quite similar and is much repeated by later writers. The statement of Franz Schmid, *loc. cit.*, p. 495, that 'Suarez [Disputatio XLVI, sect. v, no. 3: ed. C. Berton, XXI (Paris 1861), 29—30] weist auf mehrere Fälle hin, wo die hl. Eucharistie . . . in einen Stein verwandelt wurde' is not strictly accurate, because Suárez in the place cited mentions only three cases to which this would apply, and one of them is simply an error, representing possibly a slip of memory on the part of Suárez: 'Joannes diaconus in vita ejusdem Gregorii refert, mutatam esse Eucharistiam in lapidem in ore cujusdam, qui de illius veritate, cum illam acciperet, dubitavit.' For this story as it actually occurs in Joannes Diaconus, see below.

[2] *PL*, XI, 972.

[3] Cf. Richard Reitzenstein, *Historia Monachorum und Historia Lausiaca* (Göttingen 1916), p. 4.

[4] *PL*, XXI, 455. Also in the *Historia Monachorum* is a chapter entitled 'De sancto Piamone' which relates a similar vision: the saint sees an angel writing in a book the names of those monks who are receiving the communion worthily, but not recording the names of those who are unworthy (*PL*, XXI, 459—460).

later authors[1]. One day as Basil was saying Mass a certain Jew mingled among the faithful

ordinem officii et donum communionis explorare volens, et videt infantulum membratim incidi in manibus Basilii; et communicantibus omnibus venit et ipse, et data est ei in veritate caro; deinde adest et calici, qui erat sanguine plenus, et ipsius particeps est effectus. Atque ex utroque conservatas reliquias, pergens in domum suam, ostendit uxori suae . . . enarrans quae propriis viderat oculis[2].

This Basil story, the first in which the host turns into a human figure, or even in which flesh appears on the altar, was imitated in another section of the *Vitae Patrum*, the *Apophthegmata Patrum* or *Verba Seniorum*[3]. In this work a famous hermit Arsenius is supposed to have related the story of a certain old man, 'magnus in hac vita, simplex autem in fide, et errabat pro eo quod erat idiota,' who declared to two of his brethren that he did not believe in the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. They were much disturbed at his unbelief and

---

[1] A. E. Schönbach, 'Studien zur Erzählungsliteratur des Mittelalters, VI,' *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Phil.-Hist. Kl.), CLVI (1908), Abhandlung I, p. 50, accepts this story as particularly important in the later tradition of Eucharistic stories. Heinrich Günter, *Die christliche Legende des Abendlandes* (Heidelberg 1910), pp. 159—160, dates this life of Basil *ca.* A. D. 370; and says: 'Von dieser Grundform zehrt das ganze Mittelalter; sie enthielt ja den vollen Beweis für die Transsubstantiation.' While this last statement is open to question, it is nevertheless true that the story in the *Vita Basilii* served as a model for many later authors, as is stated by Peter Browe, 'Die Hostienschändungen der Juden im Mittelalter', *Römische Quartalschrift*, XXXIV (1926), 167—168. Browe, however, is not strictly accurate when he says (*loc. cit.*, p. 167, n. 2) that a similar story from the seventh century occurs in the *Liber Pontificalis* of Agnellus of Ravenna. This work of Agnellus was completed in 839 (cf. Manitius, I, 712), and the passage in question describes the apparition of a lamb before the eyes of a Jew: 'Non tibi panem sanctum quaero, pater, sed carnem agni, quam manibus vestris discerpitis, quem ego super hanc aram vos adtractantes humanis video oculis meis' (ed. O. Holder-Egger: *M. G. H., SS. rer. Langobard.* [Hannover 1878], p. 365; or *PL*, CVI, 697—698). Earlier in the same work an angel appears and assists in the consecration, but no reference is made to a transformation of the Eucharistic species (ed. Holder-Egger, p. 307—308; or *PL*, CVI, 538). A similar vision, in which a mysterious hand appears and assists in the consecration, is described in the *Vita S. Udalrici*, written about 980 by Gerard of Augsburg (*PL*, CXXXV, 1015; cf. Manitius, II, 203—208).

[2] *PL*, LXXIII, 301—302.

[3] This work is printed as Book V of the *Vitae Patrum* by Rosweyd, and the story here discussed is chap. iii of Libellus XVIII. Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis early in the fifth century, was not the author of the original of the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, though they are frequently ascribed to him because of their association in many MSS with his *Historia Lausiaca*. The collection of *Apophthegmata* was probably made not before the first half of the sixth century (cf. *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, I [Freiburg i. B. 1929], article 'Apophthegmata'). A translation of the Syriac version of both Palladius and the *Apophthegmata* has been published by E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Paradise or Garden of the Holy Fathers*. 2 vols. (London 1907.)

expostulated with him, but he replied: 'Nisi reipsa cognovero, non mihi satisfacit responsio vestra.' However, they all agreed to pray for a convincing proof, and a week later at Mass it was granted to them:

Aperti sunt autem oculi eorum intellectuales; et quando positi sunt panes in altari, videbatur illis tantummodo tribus tanquam puerulus jacens super altare. Et cum extendisset presbyter manus, ut frangeret panem, descendit angelus Domini de coelo habens cultrum in manu, et secavit puerulum illum, sanguinem vero excipiebat in calice. Cum autem presbyter frangeret in partibus parvis panem, etiam et angelus incidebat pueri membra in modicis partibus. Cum autem accessisset senex, ut acciperet sanctam communionem, data est ipsi soli caro sanguine cruentata. Quod cum vidisset, pertimuit, et clamavit, dicens: Credo, Domine . . . Et statim facta est pars illa in manu ejus panis, secundum mysterium, et sumpsit illud in ore, gratias agens Deo. Dixerunt autem ei senes: 'Deus scit humanam naturam; quia non potest vesci carnibus crudis, et propterea transformat corpus suum in panem, et sanguinem suum in vinum, his qui illud cum fide suscipiunt[1].'

It may be noted that this story told by Arsenius, like the one concerning Basil, shows the rather barbarous trait of having the child sacrificed in the hands of the celebrant, but it introduces the palliating trait of causing the flesh which was given to the doubter to be changed back into bread before it is consumed. In the Basil story, however, the phrase 'ex utroque conservatas *reliquias*' would imply that the Jew had actually eaten some of the flesh and drunk some of the blood. These barbarous traits are rarely present in stories of later origin, and though they are preserved in the later versions of the early stories, they are sometimes softened or explained away. Even in the 'Arsenius' story the reversion of the flesh and blood to the form of bread and wine serves the double purpose of eliminating one of the barbarous traits of the Basil story from which it is imitated, and of explaining or justifying in an awkward fashion the fact that Christ used bread and wine as the species under which the substance of his body and blood were to be given to the faithful.

Schönbach's remark that the flesh and blood are restored to bread and wine 'damit der Genuss des Sakramentes ermöglicht werde[2]', is true enough of the 'Arsenius' story. But his further statement that in the case of Basil and the Jew the reversion had not been necessary 'weil dieser doch erst getauft werden muſs, bevor er das Sakrament empfangen kann' is quite erroneous. The text of the *Vita Basilii* makes perfectly clear that the Jew was pretending to be a Christian[3], that the flesh was actually given to him[4], and

---

[1] *PL*, LXXIII, 978—980.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 54.

[3] *PL*, LXXIII, 301—302: 'Hebraeus quidam, ut Christianus, se populo miscuit'.

[4] *Ibid.*: 'data est ei in veritate caro'.

that he must have eaten at least some of the flesh and drunk some of the blood[1], since he saved portions which he took home and showed to his wife[2]. Rather than attempt to use Schönbach's explanation of the non-reversion of the species in the Basil story, it seems preferable to assume that in this very early text the author felt no need of softening or rendering less gruesome the details of his narrative[3].

The Eucharistic stories were given wide dissemination in the West by Gregory the Great[4], although Gregory himself relates only a few stories of the miraculous powers of the host[5], and nowhere mentions a case of transformation into either flesh and blood or a human figure. However, according to some of his early biographers, Gregory was the principal figure in an incident involving transformation of the Eucharistic species. The earliest account of his life was written probably about A. D. 713 by an anonymous monk of the monastery of Whitby[6], and in this text we already find many of the legendary stories concerning the great Pope[7], among them the tale of his deliverance of the soul of Trajan from Hell[8]. Most

---

[1] *Ibid.*: 'deinde adest et calici, qui erat sanguine plenus, et ipsius particeps est effectus'.

[2] *Ibid.*: 'Atque ex utroque conservatas reliquias, pergens in domum suam, ostendit uxori suae.' It is true that there is a mention of the subsequent baptism of the Jew, but not of his then receiving communion.

[3] A story, according to which the host is unharmed when cast into boiling water, is found in the *Pratum Spirituale*, chap. xxix (printed by Rosweyd as Book X of the *Vitae Patrum*; *PL*, LXXIV, 133). In chap. lxxix of the same work is another story, according to which the Christian servant of a heretic 'secundum provinciae consuetudinem, die sancto Coenae Dominicae sumptam communionem involvit in linteo mundissimo, et in armario reposuit'. After a considerable length of time, the heretic opened the 'armarium' and 'vidit omnes sanctas particulas culmos et spicas germinasse'. He carried them 'ad sacrosanctum et venerabilem Dionysium episcopum' (*PL*, LXXIV, 158—159).

[4] Cf. A. J. Macdonald, *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine* (London 1930), p. 251; and C. Fritzsche, 'Die lateinischen Visionen des Mittelalters bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts', *Romanische Forschungen*, II (1886), 265—266.

[5] *Dialogi*, IV, lvii—lix, ed. U. Moricca (Rome 1924: 'Fonti per la storia d'Italia, LVII'), pp. 315—322; or *PL*, LXXVII, 416—425, where the chapters are numbered differently: lv—lvii.

[6] F. A. Gasquet, *A Life of Pope St. Gregory the Great, written by a monk of the monastery of Whitby* ([London] 1904). On the date 713, see Paul Ewald, 'Die älteste Biographie Gregors I.', in *Historische Aufsätze dem Andenken an Georg Waitz gewidmet* (Hannover 1886), pp. 43 and 53, n. 3.

[7] As a matter of fact the legends concerning Gregory's miracles make up much of the substance of the book, and the author admits that his lack of definite information about Gregory's actual life has forced him to rely on hearsay: 'De quo librum scribere cupientes cum pauca eius de gestis audivimus signorum, nec fastidium sit legentibus precamur, si aliquid de laude tanti viri loquamur uberius. Multi igitur a miraculis vitam quidem sanctorum solent considerare, atque a signis sancta illorum merita metiri; et hoc nec immerito' (Gasquet, *op. cit.*, p. 4; cf. also pp. 41 and v—vi).

[8] Gasquet, *op. cit.*, pp. 38—39. This story was also frequently repeated in the later Middle Ages, though the name 'Trajan' was not always preserved,

interesting, however, is a story which here appears for the first time, concerning a certain woman who doubted that the Eucharist really contained the body and blood of Christ. When, at Mass, Gregory consecrated a piece of bread which she herself had made, and then offered it to her, saying 'Corpus Domini nostri Ihesu Christi conservet animam tuam', she smiled. Immediately the saint withdrew the host and placed it on the altar:

Tum concite secum populum Dei pariter admonuit orare in ecclesia, ut Christus filius Dei vivi dignaretur ostendere an verum corpus eius esset . . . Qua peracta oratione, sanctus vir invenit super altare quod posuit ut digituli auricularis particulam sanguilenti . . . Eosque iterum qui erant in ecclesia hortatus est ad orationem, ut ille qui eis misericordiam suam quam postulabant ostendere dignatus est, iterum dignaretur sacrum corpus suum in suam mutare naturam, de quo Eum presumebant, tantum pro infidelitate incredule mulieris, precari. Quod cum fecissent ut docuit, fecit eam communicare credulam[1].

This legendary tale does not appear in Bede's short account of the life and works of Gregory[2], nor does it occur in the genuine text of the biography composed a little after the middle of the eighth century by Paulus Diaconus (the author of the *Historia Langobardorum*)[3]. An interpolated version of the life by Paulus, however,

---

as in the *Speculum Ecclesiae* of Honorius Augustodunensis (*PL*, CLXXII, 863—864). It seems also to have been the model of a story in the life of St. Dunstan of Canterbury by the monk Osbern (*PL*, CXXXVII, 439—440); cf. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, no. 2345. There are further borrowings from Gregory's *Dialogues* in other sections of Honorius's *Speculum Ecclesiae* (*PL*, CLXXII, 1003 and 1085—1086).

[1] Gasquet, *op. cit.*, pp. 24—26.

[2] *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II, i. The claim of Charles Plummer, *Venerabilis Baedae Historia Ecclesiastica* etc. (Oxford 1896), II, 389—391, following Ewald, *op. cit.*, pp. 43—45, that Bede probably used the biography written by the monk of Whitby, is refuted by Walter Stuhlfath, *Gregor I. der Grosse, sein Leben bis zu seiner Wahl zum Papste nebst einer Untersuchung der ältesten Viten* (Heidelberg 1913), pp. 69—73. Stuhlfath claims that Bede and the monk of Whitby drew independently on oral tradition — a view that had previously been expressed by H. Moretus, 'Les deux anciennes Vies de S. Grégoire le Grand', *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXVI (1907), 66—72, whom Stuhlfath does not cite. Fedor Schneider, though he agrees in general with Moretus, claims in his review of Stuhlfath's book (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CXVIII [1917], 507—510) that the latter's demonstration is not convincing, and that the assumption of a common source in oral tradition for Bede and the monk of Whitby means merely that Bede must have known the Whitby life in a slightly variant form. Manitius, I, 83, agreed at first with Ewald and Plummer; but in his 'Nachträge zum ersten Bande', II, 795, no. 92, he abandoned his earlier view of the question and adopted that of Moretus and Stuhlfath.

[3] Manitius, I, 261; and Stuhlfath, *op. cit.*, p. 74. The discussion of this story by Schönbach (*op. cit.*, pp. 52—54) is rendered almost valueless by the fact that he used only the texts provided in Volume LXXV of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, i. e. Joannes Diaconus and the interpolated Paulus. He apparently did not consult the edition of Paulus by Grisar,

gives the story in a form that varies somewhat from that of the monk of Whitby[1], but the variations between the two texts are not such that it is necessary to assume any intermediary from which the interpolator might have drawn[2]. Both the monk of Whitby and the interpolator say that the host which Gregory withdrew from the doubting woman turned into a finger when the miracle of the transformation occurred: 'partem digiti auricularis sanguine cruentatam invenit[3]'. This trait is significant because it establishes the fact that the interpolator used the English life rather than the *Vita* by Joannes Diaconus, which was written between 873 and 875[4]. Joannes also tells the story, but he does not mention the finger[5]. He merely says that after the prayer of Gregory the host turned into flesh: 'particulam panis quam super altare posuerat, carnem factam reperit'; and again, when the flesh was changed back into bread: 'carnis frustum in panis primordia reformavit[6]'. On the other hand, the interpolated version of Paulus is later in date than 875, because Joannes says specifically that though the Lombards and the English had lives of Gregory, the Romans had none; and he was writing his book precisely to fill the gap[7]. Had the interpolated Paulus existed at this time, John would surely have used it as a 'Roman' version, in view of the phrases 'in hac civitate Romana', 'hac urbe Romana', etc. which occur only in the interpolated passages[8]. Furthermore, John says specifically that his source for the story of the doubting woman is the life of Gregory current among the English: 'Quae autem de

---

though it is mentioned by Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, I (7th ed., Stuttgart and Berlin 1904), 183, n. 2, whom he cites (p. 52—53). He seems not to have known the article by Ewald in the *Historische Aufsätze*, nor the edition of the English life by Gasquet. Consequently, he accepts Joannes as later than the interpolated Paulus, and draws a number of incorrect conclusions regarding Joannes's treatment of the story.

[1] *PL*, LXXV, 52ff. The genuine text was printed by Hartmann Grisar, 'Die Gregorbiographie des Paulus Diakonus in ihrer ursprünglichen Gestalt, nach italienischen Handschriften', *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, XI (1887), 162—173; and later, with corrections, by Stuhlfath, *op. cit.*, pp. 98—108. Grisar's list of nineteen MSS of the genuine text was extended by A. Brackmann, 'Reise nach Italien vom März bis Juni 1900', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XXVI (1901), 330—333, who lists thirty-three MSS of the genuine text and sixteen of the interpolated version.

[2] Ewald, *op. cit.*, pp. 39—40, shows that the variations are merely stylistic.

[3] *PL*, LXXV, 53.

[4] Manitius, I, 690—691.

[5] *PL*, LXXV, 103.

[6] Stuhlfath, *op. cit.*, p. 88, gives additional proof that the interpolator used the Whitby version rather than Joannes.

[7] Manitius, *loc. cit.*

[8] Stuhlfath, *op. cit.*, p. 87; also p. 88; 'Wäre der Paulus interpolatus damals schon vorhanden gewesen, so hätte er als eine römische Darstellung gegolten.'

Gregorii miraculis penes easdem Anglorum Ecclesias vulgo leguntur, omittenda non arbitror[1].' If the version provided by the interpolation had been extant, John would surely have preferred it to the English one because of its smoother Latin and its more definite statement of the place in which the miracle occurred[2].

Contemporarily with Gregory the Great, and at an earlier date than any of his biographers, Gregory of Tours, in his *In Gloria martyrum*, chap. ix, borrowed from the East[3] a story that originally had no connection with the Eucharistic transformation stories[4]. The

[1] Ewald, *op. cit.*, pp. 29—30, shows that the Whitby life is the one which served as John's source for this episode.

[2] Stuhlfath, *op. cit.*, pp. 82—83, shows by detailed comparison of readings that the version of Paulus which was used by Joannes could not have been the interpolated one. Grisar, *op. cit.*, pp. 161—162, points out that since the various specific references to Rome are not found in the genuine text, the principal basis for arguing that Paulus had ever been in Rome is removed. Cf. also on this point Manitius, I, 262; and Stuhlfath, *op. cit.*, pp. 87—88.

[3] 'Quid igitur in Oriente actum fuerit, ad conroborandam fidem catholicam non silebo' (ed. B. Krusch: *M. G. H., SS. rer. Merov.*, I [Hannover 1885], p. 494; or *PL*, LXXI, 714). H. Günter, *Legenden-Studien* (Köln 1906), p. 138, n. 1, claims that Gregory got the story from the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IV, xxxvi, of Evagrius Scholasticus (*Patrologia Graeca*, LXXXVI[2], 2770), and cites a Greek source pointed out by L. Clugnet, *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, VIII (1903), 91. Eugen Wolter, *Der Judenknabe* (Halle 1879: 'Bibliotheca Normannica, II'), p. 21, had not been able to determine the relationship between Gregory and Evagrius, who were exactly contemporary, since Gregory lived 538—594 (Manitius, I, 216—217) and Evagrius about 536—593 (K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2d ed. [München 1897], p. 245). However, Theodor Pelizaeus, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Legende vom Judenknaben* (Halle 1914), p. 19, whose work replaces Wolter's, inclines to believe that Evagrius was Gregory's source. Both Wolter (p. 21) and Pelizaeus (p. 19) agree that Gregory of Tours is the source of almost all the Latin versions of the story. To Pelizaeus's list should be added the *Liber de Miraculis*, chap. v, of Johannes Monachus (ed. M. Huber [Heidelberg 1913: 'Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, VII'], pp. 44—45), which is another and earlier instance of the redaction discussed by Pelizaeus (pp. 16—17) on the basis of a Turin MS, and which he believes may be independent of Gregory of Tours. Pelizaeus's date of *ca.* 1100 for this redaction is too late, since Huber (*loc. cit.*, p. XXI) dates Johannes Monachus as certainly earlier than 1050.

[4] Among a number of punishment stories which Gregory tells later in the same book, one (chap. lxxxvi) is associated directly with theEucharist. A drunken priest, named Epachius, 'confracto corporis dominici sacramento, et ipse sumpsit et aliis distribuit ad aedendum, mox equini hinniti ad modum vocem emittens, ad terram ruit, ac spumas cum ipsa mysterii sacra particula, quam dentibus comminuere non valuit, ab ore proiciens, inter manus suorum ab eclesia deportatur' (ed. Krusch, p. 546; or *PL*, LXXI, 782). In his *Historia Francorum*, VI, xxi (ed. W. Arndt: *M.G.H., SS. rer. Merov.*, I, 262; or *PL*, LXXI, 390—391), Gregory mentions, among other portents (*signa*): 'luna eclypsim passa est; infra Toronicum territurium verus de fracto pane sanguis effluxit.' The same expression occurs also in V, xxxiii (ed. Arndt, p. 226; or *PL*, LXXI, 349, where the chapter is numbered xxxiv). H. Günter, *op. cit.*, p. 175, n. 5, cites these as two of the earliest cases of bleeding hosts.

son of a Jewish glass-maker went to school with the Christian children, and one day

dum missarum festa in basilica beatae Mariae celebrarentur, ad participationem gloriosi corporis et sanguinis dominici cum aliis infantibus infans Iudaeus accessit. Quod sanctum adsumptum, gaudens ad domum patris revertitur; illoque operante, inter amplexos et oscula quae acceperat cum gaudio refert.

The father, enraged at the child's participation in the Christian rites, casts him into a burning furnace: 'adprehensum puerum in os fornacis ardentis proiecit'. The child's mother in her grief rouses the populace, who, upon opening the furnace, find the boy unharmed. After extracting him, they seize the cruel father and hurl him into the flames, where he is immediately destroyed. When the child is questioned by the astonished people, he answers:

Mulier, quae in basilicam illam, ubi panem de mensa accepi, in cathedra resedens, parvulum in sinu gestat infantem, haec me pallio suo, ne ignis voraret, operuit. Unde indubitatum est beatam ei Mariam apparuisse.

This story, which was to become very popular in later centuries, was borrowed from Gregory of Tours in the tenth century by Flodoard of Rheims, who turned it into verse in his work *De Triumphis Christi sanctorumque Palaestinae*, I, iii[1]. Flodoard made no essential changes in the story, though he condensed it greatly. The next user of the tale, who also got it directly from Gregory, was Sigebert of Gembloux[2]. Sigebert inserted it in his chronicle under the year 552 in a very much shortened form, but with no changes of fact. In the first half of the twelfth century the story appears in the *Speculum Ecclesiae*, a collection of sermons by Honorius Augustodunensis[3]. Although he admits that the two texts seem independent so far as phraseology goes ('was den Ausdruck anlangt'), Eugen Wolter believes that factually the dependence of Honorius on Gregory is clear[4]. However, Wolter has ignored at least two important differences between the versions in question. In Honorius's account the father of the child is not cast into the furnace by the angry populace until after he has refused to be baptized[5]; while in Gregory's text there is no mention of his being offered a chance to escape punishment. Secondly, Honorius

[1] *PL*, CXXXV, 493; written before A. D. 936 (Manitius, II, 157). This version is not mentioned by Wolter. Cf. Pelizaeus, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

[2] *PL*, CLX, 104–105 (reprinted from *M.G.H., SS.*, VI, 317). Cf. Wolter, *op. cit.*, pp. 21 and 42.

[3] *PL*, CLXXII, 852. Honorius died shortly after the middle of the twelfth century (Manitius, III, 364).

[4] Wolter, *op. cit.*, p. 22. Pelizaeus, *op. cit.*, p. 25, agrees.

[5] 'Inquirunt a patre pueri si consentiat se baptismo ablui; quo renuente hisdem flammis exurendum tradiderunt, puerum vero et matrem et omnes qui aderant Judaeos baptizaverunt' (*PL*, CLXXII, 852; and Wolter, *op. cit.*, p. 43).

introduces a detail found in none of the other early versions of this story. While Gregory says merely that the child received the Eucharist and then went home, Honorius mentions that there was inscribed above the altar an 'imago sanctae Mariae cum filio[1]', and that as the priest was distributing communion to the people 'videbatur Judaeo puerulo quod puerum illi picto similem populo divideret. Qui cum aliis accedens crudam carnem a sacerdote accepit, quam patri domum detulit.' This scene in which a child is divided before the eyes of an unbelieving onlooker, and in which the unbeliever receives a piece of raw flesh which he subsequently takes home, is an obvious imitation of the story of 'Basil and the Jew' in the *Vitae Patrum*[2]. Honorius may, therefore, be indebted to Gregory of Tours for the idea of the miraculous rescue of the child from the furnace; but he has elaborated the scene in the church with material from another source. The main purpose of his story was to give testimony of the effective intervention of the Virgin[3], but it has been adapted to serve also as a 'proof' of the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist[4]. Honorius was not particularly deft in his fusion of the two aspects of the story, for he completely forgot the Eucharistic motif in the dénouement. If this element had been of primary interest to him, one might expect him to have made the Eucharist a factor in the rescue of the child, as was done by other writers[5]. Most of the later users of this tale are, even more than Honorius, interested in it as a miracle of the Virgin, and may be safely omitted from the present discussion[6].

---

[1] In Gregory's account it is not stated that the boy had seen the Virgin and Child until after he is rescued from the furnace; and it is not clear whether his speech refers to a vision or to an image.

[2] The detail of taking the flesh home and the failure to mention what subsequently happens to it make the story of 'Basil and the Jew' seem a more probable source for Honorius than the 'Arsenius' story in which the flesh is turned back into bread. In both of these stories from the *Vitae Patrum*, the child is cut up before the eyes of the unbeliever and flesh dripping with blood is given to him. Cf. above, pp. 14—16.

[3] The sermon was intended to be preached on the feast of the 'Purificatio Sanctae Mariae'.

[4] Since Honorius wrote during the first half of the twelfth century, it is not surprising that he did not describe a desecration of the host by the Jewish father. A later writer using the same motif of the Jew to whom his son brings home a host (or a host which had turned into flesh) might not have refrained from accusing the father of desecrating the Eucharistic species. Examples are very numerous; cf. P. Browe, 'Die Hostienschändungen der Juden im Mittelalter', *Römische Quartalschrift*, XXXIV (1926), 169.

[5] Cf. below, p. 24, the version of the story contained in Paschasius Radbert's *De Corpore et sanguine Domini*, where the efficacy of the Eucharist is stressed in the denouement.

[6] A practically complete list of the Latin versions of this story is given by Albert Poncelet, 'Index Miraculorum B. V. Mariae', *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXI (1902), 251, item 95. To Poncelet's list may be added a story contained in the *De Corpore et sanguine Christi*, chap. xxxi, of

The next author after Gregory the Great and Gregory of Tours who made use of miracle stories in connection with the Eucharist was Paschasius Radbert, an abbot of Corbie in the ninth century. His work, *De Corpore et sanguine Domini*, was written about 831, and was presented to King Charles the Bald in 844[1]. This book is generally accepted as the first treatise devoted solely to the Eucharist[2], and while the exact implications of Radbert's doctrine have been much debated, the *De Corpore* was certainly an important factor in the quarrel over the Eucharist in the ninth century[3]. Because of Radbert's considerable importance in the history of the doctrine of the Real Presence, it has been commonly assumed that he was one of the most influential agents in the spread of the Eucharistic transformation stories[4].

Durand of Troarn (*PL*, CXLIX, 1420—1421). Durand's version seems to be derived directly from Gregory of Tours. Also unnoticed by Poncelet is a peculiar tale published among the doubtful works of Bede (*PL*, XCIV, 557), beginning: 'In miraculis Bonifacii papae legimus quod Dominica die cantabat missam, post missam benedixit panem, et dum communicabat populum, venit unus filius Judaei, et introivit in Ecclesiam, et accepit panem de manu sancti Bonifacii, et manducavit; et statim coepit ardere, et clamare: Sancte Bonifaci, festina me baptizare; nam panis quem indigne accepi me confundit; et venit clamor usquĕ ad Judaeos.' The rest of the story follows approximately Gregory of Tours's version of the Jewish-boy story. I have been unable to find anything similar in any of the lives of the Bonifaces listed in the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*. The first part of this composite tale seems clearly derived from the old punishment stories, as told by Cyprian in his *Liber de lapsis*, chap. xxv, and in the *Vita Basilii* (cf. above, pp. 12—14); but it also bears a very striking resemblance to an episode in the *Vita SS. Syri et Iventii*, chap. viii, published in Surius, *Historiae seu vitae sanctorum*, XII (Turin 1880), 242—243 (cf. below, p. 24). Another unnoticed analogue occurs in the *Vita S. Aldegundis*, chap. v (*PL*, CXXXII, 870), written by Hucbaldus of St. Amand in the first years of the tenth century (Manitius, I, 589 and 592).

[1] On the date of the *De Corpore*, see Manitius, I, 403; and M. Jacquin, 'Le "De Corpore et sanguine Domini" de Pascase Radbert', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, VIII (1914), 83. On the dedication to Charles the Bald, cf. Manitius, I, 404; and especially Joseph Ernst, *Die Lehre des hl. Paschasius Radbertus von der Eucharistie* (Freiburg i. Br. 1896), pp. 3—5.

[2] Martin Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode* (Freiburg i. B. 1909—1911), I, 198, 200; and Josef Geiselmann, *Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik* (Paderborn 1926: 'Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte, XV, 1—3'), p. 144; also August Naegle, *Ratramnus und die hl. Eucharistie* (Wien 1903: 'Theologische Studien der Leo-Gesellschaft, V'), p. 72.

[3] Ernst, *op. cit.*, p. 5; Naegle, *op. cit.*, pp. 71—75; Grabmann, *op. cit.*, I, 199—200; A. J. Macdonald, *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine* (London 1930), pp. 233—234.

[4] L. J. Rückert, 'Der Abendmahlsstreit des Mittelalters', *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, I (1858), 338—330; Pierre Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie, la présence réelle et la transsubstantiation* (Paris 1906: 'Études d'histoire et de théologie positive, deuxième série'), pp. 362—363; A. E. Schönbach, 'Studien zur Erzählungsliteratur des Mittelalters. VI', *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Phil.-Hist. Kl.), CLVI (1908), Abhandlung I, pp. 54—56; and Macdonald, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

An evaluation of Radbert's significance in the tradition of Eucharistic stories must be based first of all upon an examination of the text of the only work in which he relates such tales: the *De Corpore et sanguine Domini*[1]. The edition used by all modern scholars was published by Edmond Martène in his *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum . . . Amplissima Collectio*[2]. In the preface to this edition Martène, following Mabillon[3], expresses a theory that, when Radbert presented his work to Charles the Bald in 844, he prepared a second redaction which was considerably enlarged and amplified as compared with the first version[4], written in 831 for the monks of New Corbie

[1] Radbert's *Expositio in Matthaeum* and his *Epistola ad Fredugardum* are also of importance for his teaching on the Eucharist, but they contain no miracle stories; cf. Ernst, *op. cit.*, p. 5; and Macdonald, *op. cit.*, p. 234, n. 5.

[2] Vol. IX (Paris 1733), cols. 367—470. This is the edition reprinted by Migne in his *Patrologia latina*, CXX, 1255—1350.

[3] Mabillon, *Acta Sanctorum ordinis sancti Benedicti*, Saec. IV, Pars II (Paris 1680), pp. v—xxi, discusses at length Radbert's *De Corpore*. Practically nothing has been added by later scholars to the facts which Mabillon pointed out concerning the date, purpose, and dedication of the treatise. On p. x of this preface (which has not been reprinted by Migne), he states that Radbert prepared an enlarged version of the *De Corpore* when it was presented to Charles the Bald in 844. In the 'Elogium historicum' which he devotes to Radbert later in this same volume, Mabillon claims (p. 136) that the 'Codex Aniciensis' is an autograph, and that it contains three additions which he thought were present in the edition by Sirmond, but not in the 1550 Cologne edition [by Nicolaus Mameranus]. These additions he describes as 'exempla duo ex Actis S. Basilii et S. Gregorii Magni relata cap. 14 apud Sirmondum, et additamentum capitis 19 ab his verbis *reparandus credatur* [This addition corresponds to chap. xix, §§ 3—4, of the edition by Martène]. Quod idcirco noto, ne quis hos duos locos apud Sirmondum interpolatos credat.' However, Mabillon is mistaken here, for the additions in question do not appear in Sirmond's text (cf. below, p. 26, n. 5), and the *exemplum* from the life of Gregory the Great was not written in the form in which it appears in the *De Corpore*, chap. xiv, until long after Radbert's death, as will be shown below (pp. 27—28). Mabillon gives no proof that his 'Codex Aniciensis' was an autograph, and Martène, writing fifty years later and using Mabillon's and Sabbatier's collations of the MSS, calls it merely 'codex antiquissimus, atque ipsius Radberti aetate conscriptus' (*Ampl. Collectio*, IX, 369; *PL*, CXX, 1257). Mabillon's claim 'quod Paschasius libro suo non primum vulgato, sed secundis ab se curis recognito auctoque, qualis est codex Aniciensis Carolo Calvo oblatus, [haec additamenta] inseruit' has not been accepted by modern scholars to the extent of admitting any really drastic revision or amplification. Cf. Naegle, *op. cit.*, p. 71, n. 2, who cites Rückert, *op. cit.*, pp. 326—327, and [erroneously] Ernst, *op. cit.*, p. 3. Most scholars, however, have accepted the Martène edition as representing a form of the text prepared by Radbert himself. Ernst, in the place cited by Naegle, merely summarizes what Mabillon had said to refute an old hypothesis that Radbert had written two entirely distinct works on the Eucharist; cf. Mabillon, *loc. cit.*, pp. xxi ff. Migne, *PL*, CXX, 9—24, does not reprint all of Mabillon's 'Elogium', but stops with § 44 (p. 134) of the original. All of Mabillon's argument for two redactions of the *De Corpore* is in § 46 (p. 136).

[4] Martène (IX, 368; *PL*, CXX, 1256) says that 'Paschasius, cum intelligeret non sine fructu ab universis pene legi librum suum, eum denuo recognitum et variis accessionibus auctum Carolo Calvo regi obtulit.'

on the Weser, a daughter-house of Radbert's own abbey[1]. Martène based this assumption on the fact that certain fairly extensive passages in two of his MSS are not to be found in the others. These passages are:

Chap. vi, § 3. — An *exemplum* drawn from the life of St. Syrus, bishop of Pavia in the third or fourth century. According to this tale a Jew 'maligno instigante spiritu', attempted to receive the host for the purpose of desecrating it. He was punished at once by great physical suffering ('immensis torquebatur doloribus'), but was rescued by St. Syrus who withdrew from his mouth the host which he had been unable to swallow. The Jew confessed his wicked intention and was baptized. This section ends: 'Haec pro assertione sacrae communionis dicta sufficiant, nunc ad propositum redeamus'[2].

Chap. ix, § 2. — A section on the manner of transformation of the Eucharistic species, which does not harmonize entirely with the rest of Radbert's doctrine on this subject[3]. This section has been discussed by Sardemann[4], Ernst[5], and Geiselmann[6], all of whom call attention to the difficulty of bringing it into consonance with the rest of the *De Corpore*.

Chap. ix, §§ 7—8. — A short introductory paragraph (§ 7), stating that the sacrament of the Eucharist often produces great good for those who receive it worthily, and that the following *exempla* will serve as proof ('ea quae verbis diximus, exemplis quibusdam certa reddamus'). Certain of the *exempla* will be taken from the works of Gregory the Great, 'ut tanto auctore in medium adducto, firmius verba nostra roborentur'. Then, in § 8, however, follows the story of the Jewish boy rescued from the furnace, in a version taken directly from Gregory of Tours, with the addition of two sentences which make the power of the Eucharist equally important with the intervention of the Virgin in saving the child from the flames[7].

---

[1] On the purpose of the original redaction, see Mabillon, *loc. cit.*, p. viii; Ernst, *op. cit.*, p. 3; and Jacquin, *loc. cit.*

[2] Martène, IX, 397—399; *PL*, CXX, 1283—1284. The episode contained here forms chap. viii of the *Vita SS. Syri et Iventii*, published in Surius, *Historiae seu vitae sanctorum*, XII (Turin 1880), 242—243. Cf. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, no. 7976. Cesare Prelini, *San Siro, primo vescovo e patrono della città e diocesi di Pavia* (Pavia 1880—1890), I, 411—413, discusses this passage in the *Vita* of St. Syrus, but adds nothing; on pp. 164—165 of the same volume Prelini dates the *Vita* in the early seventh century.

[3] Martène, IX, 409—410; *PL*, CXX, 1294—1295.

[4] Franz Sardemann, *Der theologische Lehrgehalt der Schriften des Paschasius Radbertus* (Marburg 1877), p. 44, claimed that ix, § 2 and ix, §§ 7—12 are interpolations, but he offered no proof.

[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 48—49. Ernst admits that the passage is doubtful, but he claims that it contains nothing necessarily opposed to the doctrine of Radbert as expressed elsewhere in the *De Corpore* or the other works.

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 150.

[7] Martène, IX, 414—415; *PL*, CXX, 1298—1299. The first of the two added sentences says that before he received the Eucharist the child 'videt super altare mulierem quamdam honestae admodum formae in cathedra sedentem, parvulumque puerum super genibus suis tenentem, qui propria manu sacram communionem sacerdoti porrigebat, ut et ipse plebi fideliter accedenti distribueret'. The second added sentence is contained

Chap. ix, §§ 9—12. — Another introductory paragraph (§ 9) and then three stories from Book IV of the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great (chaps. lvii-lix). These stories, as mentioned above[1], deal with the miraculous powers of the host, but contain no transformation incidents. Chap. ix of the *De Corpore* also ends with the statement 'Haec pro assertione sacrae oblationis dicta sufficiant, nunc ad propositum redeamus'[2].

Chap. xiv, §§ 2—4. — Three stories which actually contain transformation incidents[3]: the episode concerning Basil and the Jew from the *Vitae Patrum*, in a redaction which shows only unimportant stylistic variations from the early version[4]; the story of Gregory and the doubting woman, in a redaction clearly derived from the version given by the interpolated *Vita* by Paulus[5]; the 'Arsenius' story from the *Vitae Patrum*[6].

Chap. xix, §§ 3—4. — A short passage on the necessity of the Eucharist for those who have lost the grace received at Baptism[7]. This passage is lacking in eleven of the MSS used by Martène.

Chap. xxi, § 9. — A section on the necessity of having the proper attitude of mind when receiving the Eucharist[8].

Chap. xxii, § 5. — An apostrophe to a 'fili dilectissime', which also contains the phrase characteristic of the sections containing stories of miracles: 'Haec tibi, fili dilectissime, pro ostendenda dignitate tanti mysterii pauca in praesenti opusculo hactenus dicta sufficiant[9].'

All these passages, except chap. xiv, §§ 2—3 and chap. xix, §§ 3—4, are contained in only two MSS: Vatican *Reginensis latinus 73* and Paris *Latin 2840*[10]. The Paris MS is of the eleventh century

---

in the speech of the child after his rescue. He mentions the Virgin as protecting him, and then says: 'Esca etiam illa quam de manu sacerdotis acceperam, in tantum me juvit, ut ne spiraculum quidem ignis sentire me putarem.' This version of the story shows, therefore, a more complete adaptation of the original situation to the needs of a 'Eucharistic' story than the account by Honorius Augustodunensis in his *Speculum Ecclesiae* (*PL*, CLXXII, 852), in which the Eucharist plays no part in the dénouement. Cf. above, pp. 20—21.

[1] P. 16. Each of these three stories is correctly attributed to Gregory the Great in the text.

[2] Martène, IX, 415—419; *PL*, CXX, 1299—1303.

[3] Martène, IX, 434—436; *PL*, CXX, 1317—1319.

[4] Cf. discussion above, pp. 13—14.

[5] Cf. above, pp. 17—19; and further, for the relationship to the *Vita* by the monk of Whitby, below, p. 27.

[6] Cf. above, pp. 14—15. Ernst, *op. cit.*, pp. 47—48, admits that this story stands in apparent contradiction to the teaching of Radbert and the doctrine of transubstantiation.

[7] Martène, IX, 445—446; *PL*, CXX, 1328—1329.

[8] Martène, IX, 457—458; *PL*, CXX, 1339—1340. This section is wrongly numbered 10 in Martène's edition, but has been corrected to 9 in Migne's reprint.

[9] Martène, IX, 464—465; *PL*, CXX, 1346.

[10] Martène, followed by Migne, uses of course the old numbers: *Regina Sueciae 1554* and *Regius 4070* for these two MSS.

and the Vatican MS is slightly more recent[1]. Because of the vagueness of Martène's notes it is impossible to tell just which MSS omit chap. xiv, §§ 2—3 and chap. xix, §§ 3—4[2], but since he had a number of ninth and tenth century MSS, it is surprising that he did not suspect the possibility of interpolations in those of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Dom André Wilmart, in publishing an amplified version of the *Epistola ad Fredugardum* from *Reginensis 73*, expresses some doubt of Radbert's responsibility for the additions to the *Epistola* contained in this MS[3], but he does not discuss the text of the *De Corpore*[4]. There are, in fact, a number of elements in the above outlined chapters from this work which indicate that they are not genuine parts of Radbert's text[5], and that they were probably interpolated considerably after Radbert's death, which occurred before 865[6].

The first and weakest argument that can be brought against the genuineness of the miracle stories in Radbert's work[7], is that they were not commonly used by the serious theological writers of the ninth century. In the next century some of them were accepted by the uncritical Gezo of Tortona, but it was not until the eleventh century that they were used seriously in theological treatises[8]. Radbert's contemporaries Ratramn and Rabanus Maurus ignore the stories altogether in their works on the Eucharist[9].

Secondly, the words which introduce and conclude each group of stories are hardly those which might be expected from Radbert himself. A writer who placed his confidence in dialectic would hardly

---

[1] André Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia* (Città del Vaticano 1933: 'Studi e testi, LIX'), p. 276.

[2] For chap. xiv, §§ 2—3, his note reads: 'Sex mss. hi nimirum qui omittunt ea quae de SS. Basilio et Gregorio sequuntur: *Unum et* [for *e*] *pluribus*.' For chap. xix, §§ 3—4, he says: 'Quae sequuntur . . . desiderantur in undecim mss.'

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 278.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 267, he says merely that Martène's is an 'assez bonne édition.'

[5] All these passages are lacking in the edition of the *De Corpore* which was in general use before Martène's appeared, and which was published in 1618 by the Jesuits Jacques Sirmond and André Schot. This edition was reprinted in the various seventeenth-century 'bibliothecae patrum', notably in the *Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum* of Margarin de la Bigne (Lyons 1677), XIV, 730 [wrongly numbered 720]—749.

[6] Ernst, *op. cit.*, p. 2; cf. below, p. 27, n. 4.

[7] We leave out of consideration here chap. ix, § 2; chap. xix, §§ 3—4; chap. xxi, § 9; and chap. xxii, § 5, as being concerned with matters of dogma rather than storiology, and consequently not pertinent to the present discussion.

[8] Cf. below, p. 44. Radbert himself says, in chap. xiv, § 1, that miracles involving the Eucharist have frequently occurred, but they are not necessary as proofs of the Real Presence: 'Nam quae Veritas repromisit, sine aspectu credenda sunt' (Martène, IX, 433; *PL*, CXX, 1317).

[9] For brief discussion of the Eucharistic works of Ratramn and Rabanus Maurus, and for further references, cf. Macdonald, *op. cit.*, pp. 238—242.

weaken the force of his arguments with such a statement as introduces the group of tales in chap. ix, §§ 7—12: 'perutile multis in posterum arbitror, si ea quae verbis diximus, exemplis quibusdam certa reddamus[1]'. On the other hand, this is exactly the sort of excuse that might be given by an interpolator whose concern was more for edification than for consistently logical argumentation. Similarly, the phrase which recurs with practically no variation at the end of each group of stories: 'Haec pro assertione sacrae communionis dicta sufficiant, nunc ad propositum redeamus[2]', contains its own admission that the material just related is irrelèvant, and could have been inserted only by an interpolator who realized that his work was leading the reader away from the main thread of the argument. On the other hand, it is more difficult to assume that the author of a treatise such as the *De Corpore* would deliberately digress in order to relate stories which, according to his own statement, impede the progress of his argumentation[3].

Finally, the presence of the story concerning Gregory and the doubting woman is definite proof that chap. xiv, § 3, has been interpolated. It is evident that the *Vita Gregorii Magni* by Joannes Diaconus, written in 875, could not have been used by Radbert for a work written not later than 844[4]. An examination of the text of chap. xiv, § 3, of the *De Corpore* shows clearly that it is borrowed from the interpolated form of the *Vita* by Paulus, rather than from the account by the monk of Whitby[5]. The following two cases will suffice to show this, although several might be cited. When Gregory gives the Eucharist to the woman, he says, according to the monk of Whitby: 'Corpus Domini nostri Ihesu Christi conservet animam tuam[6]'. This communion formula is completely different in the interpolated versions of Radbert and Paulus Diaconus: 'Corpus Domini

---

[1] Martène, IX, 414; *PL*, CXX, 1298. A similar phrase occurs at the beginning of vi, § 3 (Martène, IX, 397; *PL*, CXX, 1283).

[2] Chap. vi, § 3 (Martène, IX, 399; *PL*, CXX, 1284). Almost identical statements occur at the end of chap. ix, § 12 (Martène, IX, 419; *PL*, CXX, 1303) and at the end of chap. xiv, § 5 (Martène, IX, 438; *PL*, CXX, 1320—1321).

[3] The doctrine implied in some of these stories disagrees sharply with Radbert's own. Cf. Rückert, *op. cit.*, p. 338, n. 1; Naegle, *op. cit.*, pp. 186—187; and above, p. 24.

[4] L. Traube, *Poetae latini aevi Carolini*, III (Berlin 1896: *M.G.H.*), 39, n. 8, shows that Radbert had certainly died before 865. There is internal evidence also to show that the interpolator of Radbert did not use Joannes, according to whom Gregory finds the 'particulam panis quam super altare posuerat carnem factam' (*PL*, LXXV, 103); while in the Radbert passage he finds the 'partem quam posuerat in modum digiti auricularis sanguine superfusam' (Martène, IX, 435; *PL*, CXX, 1318). This trait of the bloody finger occurs in the Whitby *Vita*, Paulus interpolatus, and Radbert; but not in Joannes.

[5] The genuine text of Paulus, of course, does not contain this miracle story at all.

[6] Gasquet, *op. cit.*, p. 24; cf. also *ibid.*, n. 3.

nostri Jesu Christi prosit tibi in remissionem omnium peccatorum, et vitam aeternam[1]'. Similarly, when Gregory chides the woman after the miracle has taken place, he says to her 'Panis quem ego do, caro mea est, et sanguis meus vere est potus' according to the pseudo-Paulus and Radbert. This statement is a mixture of John 6 : 52 and 56[2]. But in the Whitby life he quotes John 6 : 54 exactly: 'Nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, et biberitis eius sanguinem non habebitis vitam in vobis'; and does not mention 52 or 56 at all. The wording of the pseudo-Paulus and of the interpolation to Radbert agrees throughout the entire tale against the phraseology used by the monk of Whitby. Since, then, the Radbert story is imitated from the pseudo-Paulus, it must have been written after the end of the ninth century, and consequently long after the death of Radbert himself[3].

There remains, however, one story in Radbert's *De Corpore*, chap. xiv, § 5, which is apparently genuine. To judge from the none-too-exact notes provided in the seventeenth and eighteenth century editions which we are forced to use[4], this story is contained in all the MSS known to the editors. The story, as given in Martène's edition[5], is as follows:

Nonnumquam vero ad votum desiderantibus Christum haec praemonstrata leguntur; sicut illud in gestis Anglorum, quod quidam presbyter fuerit religiosus valde, Plecgils nomine, frequenter missarum solemnia celebrans ad corpus S. Niniae episcopi et confessoris, qui cum digno moderamine sanctam, Christo propitio, duceret vitam, coepit omnipotentem Deum piis pulsare precibus, ut sibi monstraret naturam corporis Christi atque

---

[1] *PL*, LXXV, 52. The words 'et vitam aeternam' are omitted in the Radbert passage, but otherwise the agreement is exact.

[2] In the Vulgate John 6 : 52 is 'Si quis manducaverit ex hoc pane, vivet in aeternum; et panis quem ego dabo, caro mea est pro mundi vita'. John 6 : 56 is 'Caro enim mea vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus'.

[3] On the date of the interpolated Paulus, see above, p. 18. It is hardly possible to assume that the version of the Gregory story interpolated into Radbert's work might have been imitated directly from the Whitby *Vita* (the only one which antedates Radbert himself), since the passage was undoubtedly borrowed with very little change, as were the other stories from the *Vitae Patrum*, the *Dialogues* of Gregory, and the *Vita S. Syri*. Since the interpolator followed his sources very closely for these other tales, it is hardly possible that he would have re-worked only the one relating to Gregory. Furthermore, it is equally improbable that the interpolator of Paulus would have gone to the Whitby *Vita* for the other stories which he relates concerning Gregory — and which he re-wrote — and then have borrowed this single episode practically unchanged from Radbert.

[4] Martène's edition of 1733 can properly be called the latest, since Migne merely reprinted it in the *Patrologia latina*. As is clear from Martène's preface (IX, 370—372; *PL*, CXX, 1257—1260), the very early editions are absolutely unreliable. Cf. also H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae*, 3d ed., I (Oeniponte 1903), col. 818.

[5] IX, 436—438; *PL*, CXX, 1319—1320.

sanguinis. Itaque non ex infidelitate, ut adsolet, sed ex pietate mentis ista petivit . . . Venerat ergo dies ut idem celebrans pie solemnia missarum more solito procubuit genibus . . . qui dum talia precaretur, angelus de coelo veniens affatur: Surge, inquit, propere, si Christum videre placet; adest praesens corporeo vestitus amictu, quem sacra puerpera gessit. Tunc venerabilis presbyter pavidus ab imo vultum erigens, vidit super aram Patris Filium puerum . . . Cui angelus inquit: Quia Christum videre placuit, quem prius sub specie panis verbis mysticis sacrare solebas, nunc oculis inspice, attrecta manibus. Tunc sacerdos coelesti munere fretus, quod mirum dictu est, ulnis trementibus puerum accepit, et pectus proprium Christi pectori junxit; deinde profusus in amplexum, dat oscula Deo, et suis labiis pressit pia labia Christi. Quibus ita exactis, praeclara Dei Filii membra restituit in vertice altaris . . . Tum rursus humo prostratus deprecatus est Deum, ut dignaretur ipse iterum verti in pristinam speciem; qua expleta oratione, surgens a terra, invenit corpus Christi in formam remeasse priorem, uti deprecatus fuerat.

The statement 'Nonnumquam vero ad votum desiderantibus Christum haec praemonstrata leguntur' seems to imply that Radbert knew of other cases in which transformation visions had been granted as a reward to pious believers; but his later statement 'Itaque non ex infidelitate, *ut adsolet*, sed ex pietate mentis ista petivit' indicates on the other hand that the visions usually occurred because of the 'infidelitas' of the beholder[1]. Aside from the stories mentioned above from the *Vitae Patrum*, concerning Saints Macarius and Piamonis (and which do not involve transformation of the host)[2], there appears to be no instance earlier than Radbert (except his source for this story) in which the vision of a transformed host is granted to a believer as a reward for his piety or faith[3]. All the earlier cases follow the pattern of the story concerning Basil and the Jew or the 'Arsenius'

[1] Two statements in chap. xiv, § 1, also support the view that Radbert knew of other visions granted as a reward for piety: 'Nemo qui sanctorum vitas et exempla legerit, potest ignorare, quod saepe haec mystica corporis et sanguinis sacramenta, aut propter dubios, aut certe propter ardentius amantes Christum, visibili specie in agni formam, aut in carnis et sanguinis colorem monstrata sint' (Martène, IX, 433; *PL*, CXX, 1316), and 'Quod autem dixi saepe quibusdam visibili specie apparuisse, pauca de pluribus pandam' (Martène, IX, 434; *PL*, CXX, 1317). This second passage is slightly different in the non-interpolated version of the *De Corpore* (*Maxima Bibliotheca Patrum*, XIV, 742). However, the editions are so unreliable and are based on MSS of such doubtful value that it is impossible to know just which portions of chap. xiv are genuine.

[2] Cf. above, p. 13.

[3] This story from the *De Corpore* is cited by P. Browe, *Theologische Quartalschrift*, CX (1929), 306—307, as a model from which many of the later 'reward' stories were imitated. Browe gives no earlier examples of this type of story; nor does Franz Schmid, *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, XXVI (1902), 500—503, who discusses at some length the doctrinal implications of this new type of miracle. It may be noted that this tale, the only genuine one in Radbert's work, is free from most of the objectionable traits which Schmid points out in the earlier ones.

account, where the purpose of the miracle is to punish an unbeliever or to strengthen the faith of a doubter.

Radbert took this story from chap. xiii of the *Miracula Nynie Episcopi*, a metrical life of St. Ninian, where the episode is related in terms so similar that there can be no doubt of Radbert's direct dependence. The *Miracula* remained unpublished until 1923, when Karl Strecker included the text in the last fascicle of the *Poetae latini aevi Carolini*[1]. Strecker had shown in an earlier article that this account of the life and miracles of Ninian was mentioned in an undated letter of Alcuin, and must, therefore, have been written before 804, the date of Alcuin's death[2]. Since Alcuin's letter was written from the Continent to thank the monks of Candida Casa for sending him the text, and since, as Strecker plausibly infers, the author of the *Miracula* was probably still living at Candida Casa, the work must have been composed sometime after Alcuin left England (781)[3]. When Aelred of Rievaux wrote his *Vita S. Niniani* about the middle of the twelfth century[4], the metrical life had disappeared from England, for Aelred does not mention it. However, he did use an ancient life of Ninian which, as Strecker has shown, was also the source of the *Miracula*, and was probably known to Bede, who may have used it for the account of Ninian in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III, iv[5].

Although Bede and Aelred used the same source as the author of the *Miracula Nynie*, they do not relate the 'Plecgils' story. It was, therefore, very probably lacking in the ancient life, and must have been derived by the author of the *Miracula* from oral tradition or simply invented by him. The claim in chap. xiv of Martène's edition of the *De Corpore* that the story was to be found 'in gestis Anglorum'

[1] Vol. IV (Berlin, 1923: *M.G.H.*), pp. 943—961. On the date of the unique MS, which is of the eleventh century, cf. *ibid.*, p. 452.

[2] 'Zu den Quellen für das Leben des hl. Ninian', *Neues Archiv*, XLIII (1920—1922), 1—26; on the letter of Alcuin, see pp. 7 and 22.

[3] Strecker, both in his article (p. 19) and in the apparatus of his edition, points out verses in the *Miracula* borrowed from Bede's *Vita Cuthberti*. This life, written sometime between 705 and 715 (Manitius, I, 84), provides, therefore, a certain, if remote, *terminus a quo*. However, Alcuin says in his letter that he has read the *Miracula* only recently ('sicut mihi *nuper* delatum est per carmina metricae artis, quae nobis per fideles nostros discipulos Eboracensis ecclesiae scolasticos directa sunt' — quoted by Strecker, *art. cit.*, p. 7). He would hardly have made this remark if the *Miracula* were a work which he had known before leaving England in 781 (for this date, see Manitius, I, 273), and which had merely been sent to him recently. The fact that he refers to the monks at York as his students precludes the possibility that the letter might have been written on one of his earlier trips to the Continent in company with Aelbert, his predecessor at York. It is surprising that Strecker does not use these facts for a closer dating of the *Miracula*.

[4] Cf. Manitius, III, 144.

[5] On the relationship of Bede, the *Miracula*, and Aelred to their common source, the ancient life of Ninian, see Strecker, *art. cit.*, pp. 16—17.

is quite unfounded[1], and may easily have been inserted by the redactor who interpolated the tales of Basil and the Jew, Gregory and the doubting woman, and 'Arsenius' into the same chapter. In the non-interpolated text of the *De Corpore*, published by Sirmond[2], the claim is lacking altogether, and it occurs in only one of the three MSS used by Strecker for the edition of Radbert's 'Plecgils' which he published in the apparatus of his edition of the *Miracula*[3]. Furthermore, when the story is repeated several centuries later by William of Malmesbury in his *Gesta regum Anglorum*, III, § 286, it is introduced by the remark: 'quod Paschasius narrat contigisse Alamanniae[4]'. If William had known this story in any 'gesta Anglorum' or if he knew of its association with the tomb of St. Ninian, a British saint, he would certainly have claimed it for England, and not have attributed it to Germany (or whatever place he meant by 'Alamannia') merely on the strength of its use by Radbert[5]. The fact that William, in the same passage, also cites the miracle 'quod beatus Gregorius exhibuit Romae' and summarizes the story of the Jewish child who was saved from the furnace, but mentions Radbert only in connection with the 'Plecgils', indicates that he used a manuscript similar in content to the one published by Sirmond, but lacking the reference to St. Ninian[6]. William's treatment of the tale is further evidence of the fact that the *Miracula Nynie* had disappeared from England.

One fact remains, however, which must be mentioned in connection with the attribution of the 'Plecgils' story to some 'gesta Anglorum'. In one of the numerous Old French translations of the *Vitae Patrum*, the so-called 'Version champenoise' contained in MSS *français 1038* and *24430* of the Bibliothèque Nationale, this tale occurs between two miracle stories taken from successive chapters of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, V, xiii and xiv. The vernacular version contains no reference to a source[7], but the presence of the

---

[1] Strecker, *art. cit.*, p. 8.

[2] *Maxima Bibliotheca Patrum*, XIV, 742.

[3] *Poetae latini aevi Carolini*, IV, 957—959.

[4] *De Gestis regum Anglorum*, ed. William Stubbs (London 1887—1889: 'Rolls Series, No. 90'), II, 341. William's version is quite brief: 'Quale quod Paschasius narrat contigisse Alamanniae: presbyterum Plegildum visibiliter speciem pueri in altare contrectasse et, post libata oscula, in panis similitudinem conversum ecclesiastico more sumpsisse: quod arroganti cavillatione ferunt Berengarium carpere solitum, et dicere, "Speciosa certe pax nebulonis, ut, cui oris praebuerat basium, dentium inferret exitium"'. Strecker does not mention William's use of the 'Plecgils' story.

[5] It is possible, of course, that the 'Plecgils' story may be attributed to other sources in some of the unpublished MSS of the *De Corpore*, and that William may have had a real reason for localizing it as he does.

[6] Adam of Domerham, in his *Historia de rebus gestis Glastoniensibus*, ed. Thomas Hearne (Oxford 1727), II, 318, lists the treatise of Radbert among the works which Abbot Henry (of Blois) caused to be copied for the Glastonbury library. Cf. Nitze and Jenkins, *op. cit.*, II, 118.

[7] The 'Version champenoise' was made for Blanche of Navarre, the wife or widow of Thibaut III, Count of Champagne. It has not been

'Plecgils' story in a passage where the compiler was taking material from a very widely-known 'gesta Anglorum' suggests that the tale may at some time have been interpolated into a MS of Bede[1]. Such a MS might have been known to the redactor of the interpolated version of Radbert's *De Corpore*, and would thus have been the occasion of his adding the phrase 'in gestis Anglorum' to the tale as he found it in the genuine text of Radbert.

Critics have been liberal with their censures of Radbert for his use of miracle stories, and they have not failed to point out the contradictions between his own teaching and the obvious implications of the legends which they found in Martène's edition[2]. No one seems to have reflected that Radbert himself would probably have noticed the inconsistencies which modern scholars so triumphantly discover in his work[3]; and it has been customary either to repeat Rückert's remark 'Es hält schwer, solcher Dinge zu erwähnen, aber es muss geschehen, um die Zeit gehörig zu würdigen'[4]; or to pass over entirely the implications of the miracle stories, as Jacquin and Geiselmann have done.

---

published, and the only available information on it is contained in Paul Meyer's article 'Versions en vers et en prose des *Vies des Pères*', *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXXIII, 309, where the *incipit* of each story is given according to MS *français 1038* (early XIVth century). This MS is not available to me, but since MS *français 24430*, which also contains part of the 'Version champenoise', is accessible at the Library of Congress in Rotograph No. 82 of the Modern Language Association of America, I quote the beginning of the 'Plecgils' story from it: [fol. 111vo] 'Uns prestres estoit qui avoit non Plegiles, molt religieus, et molt volentiers cantoit sa messe a l'autel la u li cors Saint Nime le confiessour gisoit. Un jour pria Nostre Signor . . .' Since this MS corresponds very closely to as much as Paul Meyer quotes of the story from MS *1038*, it seems entirely probable that the latter likewise contains no mention of a source.

[1] From such an interpolated MS of Bede the tale could have passed into the Latin MS of the *Vitae Patrum* from which the Old French translation was made. As a matter of fact, the 'Plecgils' tale, in a redaction closely corresponding to the one in Sirmond's edition of the *De Corpore*, does occur in two of the early editions of the *Vitae Patrum*, according to a note by Rosweyd in his 1615 edition, p. 643 (reprinted in *PL*, LXXIII, 991—992). However, attractive as this hypothesis may seem, it must also be admitted that none of the surviving MSS of Bede (so far as they are represented in Plummer's edition) gives any support to it.

[2] The need for a good critical edition was, however, expressed very definitely by Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 359. Such an edition would probably have saved him from his astonishing statement (p. 363) that 'Ces récits populaires ont sans doute collaboré à la condensation de la doctrine de Paschase: l'affirmation dogmatique qu'il en dégage est son apport au développement du dogme'.

[3] The only exception seems to have been Sardemann, who said without proof (*op. cit.*, p. 44) that parts of chap. ix were interpolated. The superficiality of his work seems to have led other scholars to neglect it, though it is occasionally cited in their bibliographies (e. g. by Naegle and Macdonald).

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 339; cf. also, *ibid.*, p. 338, n. 1.

It is worthy of note that in the ninth-century controversy on the Eucharist which was stirred up by Radbert's treatise, no use was made of miracle stories. Undoubtedly the reason was that the stories did not accord with the views held by Ratramn and Rabanus Maurus, the main opponents of Radbert[1]. In the next century, however, he found enthusiastic followers in Odo of Cluny and Gezo of Tortona. Odo, in his *Collationes*, II, xxxii[2], borrows liberally from chap. viii, §§ 1, 2, 3, 5, 8 of the *De Corpore*[3] and speaks highly of Radbert; but in II, xxxii, when he quotes miracle stories, he does not mention Radbert, and says merely: 'Caeterum pro ejusdem mysterii reverentia commendanda quaedam, si placet, exempla proferamus'. He then proceeds to cite a number of cases from Gregory of Tours and the *Vitae Patrum*[4], but in no case are they the same stories as have been interpolated into Radbert's text, nor does the 'Plecgils' story, which may be authentic for Radbert, appear among them[5]. The stories in Odo's work are significant mainly because they represent one of the first efforts to collect from scattered sources stories which give testimony in favor of the doctrine of the Real Presence. The fact that he cites none of the legends which are found in Martène's edition of Radbert is, of course, a further indication that they are later interpolations.

Shortly after Odo of Cluny wrote his *Collationes*, Gezo of Tortona compiled (*ca.* 950) a *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Christi*[6], in which he incorporated Radbert's entire book. Mabillon, who discovered Gezo's treatise, did not esteem it worthy of publication and was content to print only the preface and a table of contents from one of the two MSS which he knew[7]. When Muratori, however, found a third MS, he printed most of the work, omitting those sections

[1] For a summary of their teachings see Ernst, *op. cit.*, pp. 85—99; Naegle, *op. cit.*, pp. 131—162; and Macdonald, *op. cit.*, pp. 238—243. R. Heurtevent, *Durand de Troarn et les Origines de l'Hérésie bérengarienne* (Paris 1912: 'Etudes de théologie historique, V'), pp. 182—199, gives an excellent brief account of the ninth-century controversy.

[2] *PL*, CXXXIII, 575—577. The *Collationes* were written before A. D. 924, according to Manitius, II, 21.

[3] Martène, IX, 401—408; *PL*, CXX, 1286—1293.

[4] The stories which Odo relates from Gregory are contained in the latter's *Libri Miraculorum, I: In Gloria martyrum*, chaps. lxxxv and lxxxvi (ed. B. Krusch: *M.G.H., SS. rer. Merov.*, I [Hannover 1885], pp. 545—546; or *PL*, LXXI, 781—782, where the chaps. are numbered lxxxvi and lxxxvii); from the *Vitae Patrum* he uses sections of the *Vita S. Eulogii* (*PL*, LXXIII, 1177), the *Vita S. Macarii* (*PL*, XXI, 455) and the *Vita S. Piamonis* (*PL*, XXI, 459—460). On these two latter, see above, p. 13.

[5] It should also be noted that Odo cites no case of transformation of the Eucharistic species into flesh or blood or into a living being. He does not even mention the 'Basil' story, which must have been just as accessible to him as those which he did use from the *Vitae Patrum*.

[6] On the frequent use of this title during the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, see Naegle, *op. cit.*, pp. 131—132.

[7] *Museum Italicum* (Paris 1724), Vol. I, Part ii, pp. 89—95. Cf. also Manitius, II, 56.

which were derived from well-known sources[1]. According to his own statement Gezo followed the sense rather than the exact words of Radbert[2], but the table of contents of his treatise shows that in chaps. xiv-xxxv he took over Radbert's work chapter for chapter, and to judge from the slavish way in which he follows his sources in the rest of the book (since chaps. xiv-xxxv have not been printed)[3], one is tempted to believe that he changed Radbert's text very little, if at all. Gezo admitted that his treatise was unoriginal, and that he had merely collected passages relating to the Eucharist from the works of his predecessors[4]. Manitius, II, 54—55, has listed a number of Gezo's sources which are not mentioned in the preface, but he does not give them all with exact references. Chap. xxxix is the passage from the *Vita SS. Syri et Iventii*, which has been interpolated into Radbert's text[5]. Chap. xliii is the 'Arsenius' story from the *Vitae Patrum*, also interpolated in Radbert, and discussed above[6]. Chaps. xliv and xlv are taken directly from the interpolated version of the *Vita Gregorii Magni* of Paulus Diaconus[7]. The last part of chap. xlviii is from Gregory's *Dialogues*, IV, lviii; and the immediately following chapters, xlix-liii, are from the same source, IV, lvii-lxi[8]. Manitius

---

[1] *Anecdota* (Naples 1763), III, 167—211; reprinted in *PL*, CXXXVII, 371—406.

[2] 'Ipsius vero Paschasii libellum totum paene, sicut invenimus, ita in nostrum transtulimus, sensum ejus potius in aliquibus locis, quam verba sequentes, et superflua quaeque vitantes' (Muratori, III, 169; *PL*, CXXXVII, 373).

[3] The table of contents is the same for these chapters xiv—xxxv in the MS discovered by Mabillon and that published by Muratori. However, Mabillon's chaps. lvii and lxviii seem to be missing in Muratori's edition; and on the other hand, Muratori's chaps. lxviii and lxix were apparently combined into one (lxx) in Mabillon's MS. Cf. Mabillon, *loc. cit.*, pp. 94—95; and Muratori, III, 173 (*PL*, CXXXVII, 374—375).

[4] He lists his sources in the prologue (Muratori, III, 169; *PL*, CXXXVII, 373), reprinted by Manitius, II, 56.

[5] See above, p. 21, n. 6, and p. 24, n. 2. The fact that Gezo introduces this story in chap. xxxix of his treatise indicates that it was not contained in the version of Radbert which he followed for his chaps. xiv—xxxv.

[6] *PL*, LXXIII, 978—980. Cf. above, pp. 14—16.

[7] *PL*, LXXV, 52—55. The presence of these two chapters in Gezo's treatise proves that the interpolated version of Paulus Diaconus's *Vita Gregorii* must have been made before 950, the date of Gezo's work. This fact has not been used by Stuhlfath and others who have studied the interpolated Paulus, and who have not been able to assign to it any definite *terminus ad quem*; cf. above, pp. 17—19. Manitius, II, 55, accepts Muratori's note to chap. xliv of Gezo that Joannes Diaconus, *Vita Gregorii*, II, xli [*PL*, LXXV, 103], is here the source, though he remarks that Gezo's text is much fuller and differs on many points, and that therefore, since Gezo usually followed his sources word for word, he probably used 'einen erweiterten und abgeänderten Bericht des Johannes.' It seems not to have occurred to him that both chaps. xliv and xlv might be found in Paulus interpolatus.

[8] *Dialogi*, ed. Moricca, pp. 315—324; or *PL*, LXXVII, 416—428, where the chapters are numbered differently: lv—lix.

gives the original sources of chaps. lvii, lviii, lxiv, and lxvii as, respectively, Eusebius, a *Vita S. Walburgis*, Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and Paulus's *Historia Langobardorum*. However, it seems very unlikely that Gezo got these chapters directly from such a variety of sources[1], since he could have taken these and all his other chapters between lvii and lxvii from Odo of Cluny's *Collationes*. He does not tell the stories in the same order as Odo, but his text for each one agrees literally with that of Odo[2]. It is to be doubted that any extended passage in the whole treatise is original with him, but he still possesses a certain significance in that he, like Odo of Cluny and Heriger of Lobbes[3], represents faithfully the custom of his time in compiling an extensive collection of excerpts from both patristic and contemporary sources, and in making little effort toward independence of thought[4]. At least he showed a certain industry in making his collection, for his sources, as has been shown above, are more numerous than he claims — or admits — in his preface[5].

One chapter of Gezo's treatise, for which no source has ever been identified, contains a miracle which differs in a number of ways from any of the stories which have been discussed thus far. As Manitius has pointed out, Gezo contradicts himself in citing sources here, for he begins the account by saying that he had heard the tale from a certain Jew[6], apparently not noticing that he had declared only a

[1] Of these four, Gezo mentions only Bede in his prologue; Mabillon, *loc. cit.*, p. 91; Muratori, III, 169 (*PL*, CXXXVII, 373).

[2] I give here a list of Gezo's borrowings from Odo's *Collationes*. The numbers in parentheses refer to the columns of the edition of Odo in *PL*, CXXXIII:

chap. lvii	from	II, xxviii	(572—573)
lviii	,,	II, xxviii	(573)
lix	,,	II, xxix	(574)
lx	,,	II, xxvi	(570)
lxi	,,	II, xxvi	(570)
lxii	,,	I, xxii	(534)
lxiii	,,	I, xxiii	(535)
lxiv	,,	I, xxiv	(535)
lxv	,,	I, xxvi	(537—538)
lxvi	,,	II, xi	(558)
lxvii	,,	II, xi	(558—559).

[3] See below, pp. 36—38.

[4] Cf. Grabmann, *Scholastische Methode*, I, 185; and Geiselmann, *Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik*, p. 258.

[5] It is interesting to note that even though he used Odo of Cluny's *Collationes*, Gezo chose a different story from the *Vitae Patrum*, the 'Arsenius' tale, and did not appropriate those which Odo himself relates in Bk. II, chap. xxxiii.

[6] 'Non incompetenter edere arbitror illud, quod hactenus quodam Hebraeo didici referente' (Muratori, III, 196; *PL*, CXXXVII, 393). Schönbach, *op. cit.*, p. 56, is wrong in saying that Gezo relates 'in den Kapiteln 41—45, die Geschichten vom „jüdel", von Arsenius . . .' The story of the Jewish child cast into the furnace does not occur in Gezo's work at all, nor does chap. xli contain any miracle story. Schönbach probably accepted the title of chap. xlii, 'Miraculum de quodam Judaeo', as indicating the story of the Jewish child, without troubling to read the text.

few lines before his intention to relate incidents gathered in his reading[1]. The story (contained in chap. xlii) has two sections, the first of which is concerned principally with Baptism. The second, somewhat shorter, part involves a miracle of the Eucharist:

Igitur cum ad missarum fuisset mysteria ventum, sancta sanctorum coepit rursus, sicut in baptismo prius egerat, refugere, et rugitus validi gemitus dare, atque horrere videbatur acriter ipsius mysterii sacramentum. Verum ad haec episcopus iterum obstupescens: Quid, ait, iste vexatus insanit, et furore immodico rugit. Igitur cum aliquatenus simus [?] aderant simul attoniti prorsus haererent, accedunt ad eum quidam dicentes: Quid tu rursum deprimeris stupore? Si credere non vis, quid per hypocrisin tentare vis tanti mysterii sacramentum. At ille: Maximo, inquit, pavore et tremore conficior, nam video corpus perfectae aetatis viri super hoc altarium fuisse depositum, et per partes diruptum, manus vestras ipsius inspicio cruore madescere, et non advertitis digitorum vestrorum nodos sanguine infectos rubrum mutasse colorem? Tunc omnes cum episcopo in fletum versi coeperunt clamantes voce valida fari . . . Non incassum ipsi tanti mysterii revelatur arcanum, in ipso enim ut referebat, ni fallor, ille qui dixerat, die septimo, cum ipsis albis candidam animam lux alma suscepit; nam absolutis vinculis carnis beatam vitam pulchro fine conclusit[2].

This tale is undoubtedly modelled on the story from the *Vita Basilii*, but it contains an interesting and daring innovation in its presentation of the Eucharistic apparition as a full-grown man, instead of as a child[3]. It is also like the 'Basil' story, and unlike the 'Arsenius', in that the Eucharistic figure is torn apart in the hands of the priest[4], not sacrificed by an angel which comes down from heaven with a knife in its hand. It is also similar to the 'Basil' story, and unlike the 'Arsenius', in that no mention is made of any reversion of the human figure to the appearance of bread and wine, in this case of course because the whole event is portrayed as a vision.

Another typical Eucharistic treatise of the tenth century is the *Dicta de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, now ascribed to Heriger of Lobbes[5]. This work is a collection of excerpts from the usual patristic

[1] 'Non abs re autem arbitror ea, quae de hujuscemodi revelationibus nobis lectione comperta sunt, ad aedificationem maximam posterorum huic libello inserere' (Muratori, III, 195; *PL*, CXXXVII, 393). Manitius, II, 55, believes that Gezo merely copied, along with the story itself, the attribution to an oral source which he found in the work from which he was borrowing. This explanation is rendered the more plausible by the fact that Gezo relates no other miracles of which he might have heard personally.

[2] Muratori, *Anecdota*, III, 197; *PL*, CXXXVII, 394–395.

[3] On the comparative rarity of this detail in Eucharistic legends, see Franz Schmid, *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, XXVI (1902), 500.

[4] The 'Basil' story has: 'videt infantulum membratim incidi in manibus Basilii', with no mention of a sacrificing angel (*PL*, LXXIII, 301).

[5] Published in *PL*, CXXXIX, 179–188, among the works of Gerbert of Rheims (Pope Sylvester II). The date of Heriger's birth is unknown.

sources and makes no use of miracles, except for the following allusion to the 'Arsenius' story:

aliquando quidam simplices et idiotae, ferventes vero bonis operibus et pietate, melius pura proficere fide quam fucato sermone. Senes illi in Vita Patrum, alium aeque senem ac virum sanctum, sed pro hoc mysterio dubium, non dialecticis argumentationibus, sed verbis simplicibus et oratione compulerunt ad credendum, illud quod sumimus de altari, naturaliter esse corpus Domini, cum et in veritate, non figuratum[1].

The authorship of this work has been much disputed ever since Mabillon first ascribed it to Heriger[2]. Among modern scholars opinions were divided until E. Dümmler[3] announced his discovery of a MS containing another work entitled *Exaggeratio plurimorum auctorum de corpore et sanguine Domini*, which could be ascribed to Heriger with certainty. He believed that the *Dicta* could not, therefore, be the work of Heriger. However, G. Morin[4] argues convincingly that both the *Dicta* and the *Exaggeratio* are by the same author: Heriger. According to Dümmler[5] and Morin[6], the *Exaggeratio* (which has never been published) contains a passage from Radbert's *De Corpore*, chap. xiv, §§ 1—3 (beginning 'Nemo qui sanctorum' and ending 'mysterio sanaretur'). They have both failed to note, however, that the following section of the *Exaggeratio* (item 21 in Morin's list of the contents) also directly follows in Radbert's treatise, chap. xiv, §§ 4—5. In Heriger's work this section begins 'Narrabat abbas Danihel', which is the opening of the 'Arsenius' story in the *Vitae Patrum*[7], where the story is identical with the one in the interpolated

---

He was active as a writer as early as 980, and he died in 1007. Cf. Manitius, II, 223.

[1] *PL*, CXXXIX, 185.

[2] *Acta Sanctorum O.S.B.*, Saec. IV, Pars II, pp. xxi—xxiv.

[3] 'Zum Heriger von Lobbes', *Neues Archiv*, XXVI (1901), 755—759.

[4] 'Les *Dicta* d'Heriger sur l'Eucharistie,' *Revue Bénédictine*, XXV (1908), 1—18. Oskar Hirzel, *Abt Heriger von Lobbes* (Leipzig 1910: 'Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, VIII'), p. 29, adds nothing to the discussion, since he merely accepts without independent investigation the decision of Hauck (*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* [Leipzig 1896], III, 320, n. 3) and Dümmler (*loc. cit.*) that Heriger was not the author of the *Dicta*. Apparently Hirzel did not know Morin's article, although it had appeared two years before his own work. Manitius, in his 'Nachträge zum ersten Bande', II, 805, no. 416, is wrong in citing Hirzel as proving that the *Dicta* are not by Heriger; but he is right in saying with Morin that Heriger produced two works on the Eucharist. D. De Bruyne, in his review of Manitius's second volume, in 'Bulletin d'ancienne littérature chrétienne latine', *Revue Bénédictine*, XXXVI (1924), [160], corrects the mistakes of Manitius concerning Heriger, and summarizes and accepts Morin's conclusions regarding the latter's Eucharistic writings. For a thorough discussion of the dogmatic content of Heriger's two works, and an evaluation of his importance in the theological thought of his time, see Geiselmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 267—281.

[5] *Loc. cit.*, p. 757.

[6] *Loc. cit.*, p. 4, item 20.

[7] *PL*, LXXIII, 978. Cf. below, p. 43, n. 4.

text of Radbert except for the first few words. Section 21 of the *Exaggeratio* ends 'quod exterius uisu conspexerat'; and this is the ending of the 'Plecgils' story as it is found in chap. xiv, § 5, of Martène's edition of the *De Corpore*[1]. All the contents of sections 20 and 21 of Heriger's collection are, therefore, found in the same order in chap. xiv, §§ 1—5 of the interpolated version of the *De Corpore*. Since the first part ('Nemo qui sanctorum': chap. xiv, § 1) and the last part (the 'Plecgils' story: chap. xiv, § 5) are apparently genuine for Radbert, while the middle parts (corresponding to chap. xiv, §§ 2, 3, 4) are surely interpolated, the preparation of the interpolated *De Corpore* must have taken place before the composition of Heriger's treatise. Does MS 6. F. 30 (XIth century) of the Seminary of Liège, the oldest MS of the *Exaggeratio*, represent a possible *terminus ad quem* for the interpolation of Radbert's text?

Petrus Damiani (born 1007)[2] refers to Paschasius Radbert in his *Liber gratissimus*, chap. ix[3], but does not borrow any miracles from him. In some of his other works, however, he relates stories which conform to the types that by his time had become fairly well established. In his *De frenenda ira*, chap. vi[4], he tells of the punishment of a wicked priest, who 'dum missarum celebraret officium, inter ipsam Dominici corporis fractionem, tres repente favillae ignis ex ipso coelesti sacramento prodeuntes emicuerunt, et in pectus sacrificantis terribiliter impegerunt'. This punishment story has two features which differentiate it from the older ones[5]. It relates the punishment of the celebrant himself and not of a beholder or recipient of the sacrament; and it occurs as a punishment for the wicked life of the priest, not because of his doubt concerning the sacrament of the Eucharist nor because of his pious love of God. 'Aut propter dubios, aut certe propter ardentius amantes Christum' had been the two reasons alleged by Radbert for the occurrence of Eucharistic miracles[6]. Such a change in the purpose of the story is not surprising in Damiani, concerned as he was with the reform of the clergy. To this story Damiani does not add the obvious warning that a priest should be careful of his mode of life, but he does make such an application of another story which he tells in his *De Castitate*, chap. ii[7], where he adjures his reader to live a good life so that 'videat occultus hostis labia tua Christi rubore rubentia, quae territus perhorrescat'. He then

---

[1] Cf. above, pp. 28—30.

[2] Manitius, III, 68; and J. P. Whitney, 'Peter Damiani and Humbert', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, I (1925), 227.

[3] Published as *Opusculum VI* in *PL*, CXLV; for the reference to Radbert see col. 109. This work was written in 1052, according to Whitney, *loc. cit.*, p. 235.

[4] *Opusculum XL*; for chap. vi, see *PL*, CXLV, 656.

[5] Those told by Cyprian, and the stories from the *Vita S. Basilii* and *Vita S. Syri*.

[6] *De Corpore*, chap. xiv, § 1 (Martène, IX, 433; *PL*, CXX, 1316).

[7] *Opusculum XLVII* (*PL*, CXLV, 712).

proceeds to relate that the negligence of those charged with the care of the Eucharist has sometimes brought about miracles which remind them that they are dealing with the body and blood of Christ: 'dum longiori per negligentiam tempore eucharistia reservata fuisset in buxide, sola postmodum illic caro fuerit reperta'. And again a careless priest, who noticed that some wine remained in the chalice,

> noluisset accipere, mox calicem lavit, et in labrum marmoreum in quo erat aqua sanctificata, projecit . . . illam labri partem quam id quod effusum est de calice, contigit, in sanguineum ruborem repente convertit, ubi scilicet duae majores guttae sanguinis exprimuntur; sed neque illae, neque aliae quae juxta videntur esse minusculae, nullo possunt studio vel ablui vel abstergi, quo rubor impressi sanguinis aliquatenus valeat aboleri.

A similar punishment story occurs also in the prologue to his *Opusculum XXXIV*[1]: where a woman conceals a host in a piece of cloth until she can use it as a charm to assure herself of her lover's fidelity: 'non sine magno dedit stupore miraculum. Haec enim particula Dominici corporis inventa est usque ad medietatem in carnem esse conversam, altera vero medietas panis speciem non mutavit'[2].

Damiani's one story, in which the person who sees the miracle is said to be an unbeliever, occurs also in the prologue to *Opusculum XXXIV*[3]. A certain bishop of Amalfi 'cum aliquando ad mensam Domini sacrificaturus accederet, sed super sacramento Dominici corporis incredulus haesitaret, in ipsa confractione salutaris hostiae, rubra prorsus ac perfecta caro inter ejus manus apparuit, ita ut etiam digitos illius cruentaret, sicque sacerdoti omnem scrupulum dubietatis auferret'[4]. But even in this story Damiani cannot forget his zeal for the reform of the clergy, so he continues with an admonition that those who are unworthy run great risks when they touch this 'tam terribile sacramentum'[5].

The Eucharistic heresy of Berengar of Tours, which caused great disturbance in northern France during the third quarter of

---

[1] *De variis miraculosis narrationibus* (*PL*, CXLV, 572—573). The statement of Schönbach, *op. cit.*, p. 57, that this is the only case of transformation of the Eucharistic species in Damiani's work is, of course, erroneous since the instance cited above from the *De Castitate*, chap. ii, is quite similar.

[2] Cf. P. Browe, 'Die Eucharistie als Zaubermittel im Mittelalter', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XX (1930), 135—137, who discusses the use of consecrated hosts as love-charms in the Middle Ages, and says that no examples of the practise are to be found earlier than the middle of the eleventh century. This case in Petrus Damiani is the earliest one he cites.

[3] *PL*, CXLV, 573.

[4] Geiselmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 396—400, in his study of the ideas of Damiani on the Eucharist, is forced to base most of his discussion on the material provided by these miracle stories, because Damiani's statements elsewhere in his works are not very specific on this subject.

[5] 'Ubi notandum quam sit immane periculum indignis manibus attrectare tam terribile sacramentum' (*PL*, CXLV, 573).

the eleventh century[1], called forth a number of works which defended the orthodox doctrine. One of the first of these was the *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Christi contra Berengarium et ejus sectatores* by Durand of Troarn, written between 1054 and 1058[2]. In the eighth part of his treatise Durand introduces a number of miracle stories, but with no preliminary or concluding statement to indicate their special purpose. The last section of the preceding part (VII) contains two incidents from a certain *Dialogus Joannis et Basilii*, which testify to the presence of angels at Mass, but which speak rather 'de cujus [i. e. Eucharistiae] magnitudine terribili, magisque reverenda quam discutienda'[3]. After relating the two angel stories, Durand says of them 'in quibus quia revelatio divinitus ostensa continetur, alias, etiam diversis repertas in locis, narratum ire operae pretium duximus; maximam enim legentibus utilitatem pollicentur'[4]. He then begins immediately with Part VIII and relates (Section xxvii) the story of Gregory and the doubting woman, but in a more condensed version than any of his predecessors. However, it is clear from a number of elements in his text that he is following the interpolated Paulus[5]: the communion formula, 'Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi prosit tibi in vitam aeternam', is the same[6]; and Gregory preaches a sermon to the people on the subject of the Eucharist before the transformation of the host takes place[7] — a trait which is lacking

---

[1] On the disturbance caused by Berengar's doctrine, see Durand, *De Corpore*, Pars IX (*PL*, CXLIX, 1421—1422); William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum*, III, § 284 (ed. Stubbs, II, 338); Edmund van Dynter, *Chronicon*, III, iv (ed. P. F. X. de Ram, *Chronique des Ducs de Brabant*, I, 1 [Brussels 1854], 533); cf. R. Heurtevent, *op. cit.*, pp. 123ff.; Grabmann, *op. cit.*, I, 220—224; and Macdonald, *op. cit.*, pp. 44ff.

[2] See, for a summary of opinions on the date of Durand's work, Macdonald, *op. cit.*, p. 121, n. 5.

[3] *PL*, CXLIX, 1417.

[4] *PL*, CXLIX, 1418.

[5] Schönbach, *op. cit.*, p. 56, misled by the brevity of Durand's account, concludes that it is based on the version by Joannes Diaconus, which in its turn is briefer than the account in the interpolated Paulus, or in the Whitby *Vita*. Heurtevent, *op. cit.*, p. 232, also erroneously assumes that Durand followed Joannes Diaconus.

[6] On the value of the communion formula for differentiating Joannes Diaconus and Paulus interpolatus, see above, p. 27.

[7] Durand's text reads here: 'sermonem de re ad populum fecit, deinde preci cum fideli clero incubuit' (*PL*, CXLIX, 1418); and Paulus interpolatus has: 'sermonem exinde fecit ad populum, et hortatus est eum ut suppliciter Dominum exoraret' (*PL*, LXXV, 53). On the other hand, Joannes Diaconus has simply: 'cum tota plebe se in orationem prostravit' (*PL*, LXXV, 103); and the monk of Whitby: 'Tum concite secum populum Dei pariter admonuit orare in ecclesia' (ed. Gasquet, p. 25). Durand's version of this story resembles that of Joannes Diaconus in its omission of the trait of the bleeding finger, into which the host was transformed according to the Whitby life and the interpolated versions of Paulus Diaconus and Paschasius Radbert (cf. above, p. 27, n. 4). A theologian like Durand could not have failed to see the undesirable implications of this detail; and the fact that he omitted it is only negative evidence that he

in the accounts by the monk of Whitby and Joannes Diaconus. The next story in Durand's text is the 'Plecgils', which he has surely borrowed from Radbert, rather than from the *Miracula S. Nynie*[1]. Here again Durand compresses the narration, omits unnecessary details, and even discards all proper names and references to a source. In his version of the 'Arsenius' story which follows, however, he reworks only the first part of the story and then follows his source word for word from 'et quando positi sunt panes in altare'[2] to the end with only slight changes in the last few lines. His version of the tale of Basil and the Jew, on the other hand, shows a thorough re-writing of the earlier story with added details, though none of them is significant[3]. He inserts immediately after this story a brief discussion of its credibility 'Si cui autem movet scrupulum acta res dubietatis etc.', and ends the section with a vindication of it. The version of the Jewish child rescued from the furnace which Durand presents in the next section (xxxi) is based obviously on Gregory of Tours[4], and shows only stylistic changes. It is noteworthy that the version of this story in Durand is far inferior to the one interpolated in Radbert's chap. ix, § 8, where an adaptation of the story was made to fit it better to the purpose it serves as a 'proof' of the importance of the Eucharist in the rescue of the child[5].

Durand's chapter on miracles ends as abruptly as it begins. He draws no generalizations from the stories he has told, but simply stops immediately after the story of the Jewish child. Part IX does not again take up the miracles, but contains his special treatment of Berengar. This peculiarly disjointed character of Durand's book has also been noticed by Heurtevent[6], who remarks that, 'Le moindre reproche qu'on puisse lui faire est de manquer d'ordre', and then even surmises that several successive additions may have been made to the work by the author. It is, unfortunately, not possible to confirm the authenticity of the stories in Durand's work since only one MS of it has survived[7], but on the other hand their genuineness cannot be attacked

---

might have known the version by Joannes Diaconus. Such negative evidence is outweighed by the positive evidence just adduced to show his dependence on the interpolated Paulus.

[1] He cites Radbert in Part IV, Section x (*PL*, CXLIX, 1389) in another connection.

[2] This is in Section xxix of Durand (*PL*, CXLIX, 1419); for the quotation as he found it in the *Verba Seniorum*, see above, p. 15.

[3] Section xxx (*PL*, CXLIX, 1419—1420).

[4] Durand's version of the story is not mentioned by Poncelet in his *Index Miraculorum B. V. Mariae*, though Poncelet does cite others which have practically the same *incipit*. Cf. above, p. 21, n. 6.

[5] Cf. discussion of this point above, p. 24, n. 7.

[6] *Op. cit.*, pp. 233—234. Geiselmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 316—327, does not find it necessary to mention the miracle stories at all in his analysis of Durand's teaching on the Eucharist.

[7] Heurtevent, *op. cit.*, p. 217, n. 1; Hurter, *Nomenclator*, I, col. 1053, also says that Durand wrote 'erudite quidem, sed minus ordinate et stilo nimis diffuso.'

on chronological grounds, as was possible in the case of Radbert. Durand's selection of stories includes only old and well-known cases from the *Vitae Patrum*, Gregory of Tours, Paulus interpolatus, and the one story from Radbert. Yet it is interesting that Durand, like Gezo, did not choose from the *Vitae Patrum* the same stories that Odo of Cluny had used[1].

At a slightly later date than Durand of Troarn, Guitmund, Archbishop of Aversa, wrote a book which refuted the Berengarian heresy in more systematic and detailed fashion. Guitmund's work, *De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate*[2], is a carefully constructed, well thought-out theological monograph which contributed greatly to the philosophical explanation of Eucharistic dogma[3]. In spite of his reliance on dialectic Guitmund did not hesitate to cite a number of Eucharistic miracles in support of his thesis. Like Durand, he used old and widely-known stories, but he was careful in addition to use only those which were immediately pertinent to his argument[4]. He, therefore, omitted the story of the Jewish child in the furnace, which Durand had used, though indeed in a less dexterous fashion than the interpolator of Radbert. Guitmund, after a defense of the miracle stories, which is at the same time an attack upon those who refuse to accept them, proceeds to relate briefly the story of Gregory and the doubting woman[5]. It is interesting to note that Guitmund, like Durand and the interpolator of Radbert, uses the interpolated *Vita* of Paulus Diaconus. At first sight his description of his source as the 'vitam beati Gregorii . . . quam attestante Roma editam, tot sanctissimi doctissimique Romani pontifices nullo dissonante, hactenus probaverunt' might lead one to believe that he had used the *Vita* by Joannes, which was indeed written in Rome and at the command of John's ecclesiastical superiors[6], while Paulus seems never to have been in Rome at all[7]. However, it will be remembered

[1] Cf. above, p. 35, n. 5. There is, of course, no indication that Durand knew or used Odo's *Collationes*.

[2] Ed. H. Hurter (Oeniponte, 1879: 'Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula Selecta, XXXVIII'); also, from an older edition, in *PL*, CXLIX, 1427–1494. Guitmund's book was written about 1075; certainly not before 1073 nor after 1078. Cf. Macdonald, *op. cit.*, p. 172, n. 1.

[3] On Guitmund, see Hurter, *Nomenclator*, I, cols. 1053–1054; Grabmann, *op. cit.*, I, 222–223; Geiselmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 375–396; and Macdonald, *op. cit.*, pp. 341–356, and p. 173, where Macdonald says that as a contribution to the development of Eucharistic doctrine Guitmund's work far outweighs those of Durand and Lanfranc.

[4] In Book II, § 9, Guitmund relates one story which he attributes to Lanfranc; 'cum presbyter quidam missam celebrans, inventam super altare veram carnem et verum in calice sanguinem secundum propriam carnis et sanguinis speciem sumere trepidaret, rem protinus suo episcopo consilium quaesiturus aperuit' (ed. Hurter, p. 63; *PL*, CXLIX, 1449–1450). This story, however, does not seem to be extant in the works of Lanfranc.

[5] Book III, §§ 22–24 (ed. Hurter, pp. 143–145; *PL*, CXLIX, 1479).

[6] Cf. Manitius, I, 690–691; and above, pp. 18–19.

[7] Cf. above, p. 19, n. 2.

that John in his description of the miracles of Gregory expressly refers to his source as a life of Gregory in use in the English churches, and omits all reference to the place where the miracles occurred[1]. On the other hand, the interpolator of the Paulus life, writing later than John, but before 950 (since he was used by Gezo of Tortona), was equally accessible to Guitmund, and in his interpolation the statement is made that the miracle took place 'in hac civitate Romana'[2]. A further trait which definitely establishes the interpolated Paulus as the source for Guitmund is that when the host is transformed in Joannes's account it becomes merely a piece of flesh: 'particulam panis quam super altare posuerat, carnem factam reperit;' but in both the interpolated Paulus and in Guitmund it turns into a finger: 'partem digiti auricularis sanguine cruentatam invenit'[3].

Guitmund next relates the 'Arsenius' story, citing it as told in the *Vitae Patrum* by 'abbas Daniel' himself, and omitting mention of the usual narrator Arsenius[4]. This story he compresses greatly, though he retains all the details that have an immediate bearing on the matter of the Real Presence[5]. His procedure of elimination of superfluous detail reaches its extreme in the third story which he tells: 'Basil and the Jew.' He mentions it as the 'gesta Basilii, inter cujus manus judaeus in medio frequentis latitans populi, sacrificii tempore partiri puerulum vidit, exclamavit, et propterea baptizatus est'[6].

Finally, in a special section at the end of Book III, §§ 49—50[7], he refutes in detail the erroneous conclusions drawn by some of his opponents from the 'Macarius' story of the *Vitae Patrum*[8], in which 'cuidam seni visus sit angelus ad communionem sacram indignis accedentibus corpus Domini subtrahere, et loco ejus carbonem dare.' His opponents claimed that this miracle proved that at least part of the Eucharistic bread might not be transformed into the flesh and blood of Christ at the consecration, or that when it was given

---

[1] *PL*, LXXV, 103: 'Quae autem de Gregorii miraculis penes easdem Anglorum Ecclesias vulgo leguntur, omittenda non arbitror.'

[2] *PL*, LXXV, 52.

[3] Guitmund's version reads: 'in specie verae carnis quasi digiti auricularis ostenderit' (ed. Hurter, p. 145; *PL*, CXLIX, 1479). Cf. above, p. 27, n. 4.

[4] Cf. above, pp. 14—15. The story actually begins in the *Verba Seniorum* as follows: 'Narravit iterum abbas Daniel, dicens: Dixit Pater noster abbas Arsenius de quodam sene . . .' (*PL*, LXXIII, 978).

[5] Book III, § 25 (ed. Hurter, p. 146; *PL*, CXLIX, 1479—1480).

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] Ed. Hurter, pp. 177—178; *PL*, CXLIX, 1491—1492.

[8] He himself uses the 'Macarius' story in Book II, § 19 (ed. Hurter, pp. 71—73; *PL*, CXLIX, 1453) to disprove a stercoristan interpretation of the doctrine of the Real Presence which had been advanced by Berengar (cf. Macdonald, *op. cit.*, p. 310). Guitmund does not mention the name Macarius in either of his references to the story, but he does say that it is contained in the *Vitae Patrum*.

to an unworthy recipient the Eucharist reverted to mere bread and wine. Guitmund maintains that the story does not support either of these heretical views, and that it may be much more logically used in defense of the orthodox teaching. The earnest argumentation with which he establishes the orthodoxy of the 'Macarius' story is of less importance here for what it actually proves than for the way in which it reveals Guitmund's concern over the dogmatic implications of a current legend. His vehement defense of miracle stories in general is far more interesting and significant than the banal instances which he actually cites[1]. On several occasions he denounces the refusal of Berengar and his followers to accept the miracles described in the *Vitae Patrum* and in the biography of Gregory[2]. He appeals to ecclesiastical tradition as having lent its weight to the stories of miracles and as providing a guarantee of their truthfulness:

> Sed sunt qui miracula se non respuere quidem respondeant; libros vero in quibus ea leguntur apocryphos asseverent. O iniqua licentia! Quos Ecclesia Dei in aedificationem sui per totum orbem tantis temporibus sub tantis doctoribus legit et legendos tradidit, hos pauculi minus docti et animales, nullo rationis intuitu, nisi tantum quia non placet eis, apocryphos dicunt, et qui paganorum libenter historias amplectuntur, christianas historias, quas totus amplectitur mundus, cassare laborant. Sed et hoc ipso quod eis non placet, quod universali Ecclesiae placuit, et obstinate respuunt quod libenter illa recepit, non pacificos ejus filios, sed inimicos manifestos se probant[3].

This diatribe of Guitmund's — and it is only one of several in his book[4] — is indicative of a new attitude toward miracle stories.

---

[1] It may be pointed out in this connection that Guitmund is not rigorously exact in his reproduction of the 'Macarius' story, where originally it was 'puerulos Aethiopes tetros' who gave coals to the unworthy communicants, while the angel participated only in the communion of the worthy recipients. Cf. above, p. 13.

[2] 'Vitam beati Gregorii quilibet christianus apocrypham dicat' (ed. Hurter, p. 145; *PL*, CXLIX, 1479), where the 'christianus' is undoubtedly an ironical reference to Berengar. In Book II, § 4, after relating a vision from one of Gregory's homilies, Guitmund says: 'Quod si objicias (ut dici assolet), quia Berengarius vitas sanctorum pro auctoritate non recepit, scias, quia tametsi quasdam sanctorum vitas non recipit, beati Gregorii tamen libros nunquam eum respuisse prout recordor' (ed. Hurter, p. 57; *PL*, CXLIX, 1447). P. Browe, 'Die eucharistischen Verwandlungswunder des Mittelalters,' *Römische Quartalschrift*, XXXVII (1929), 168, discusses Guitmund's defense of miracle stories, and gives the reference to the passage in Berengar's *De sacra coena* (ed. A. F. and F. Th. Vischer; Berlin 1834), p. 37, where the stories are rejected.

[3] Book III, § 23 (ed. Hurter, pp. 144—145; *PL*, CXLIX, 1479).

[4] Cf. also Book II, § 19, and Book III, § 26 (ed. Hurter, pp. 71—72 and 146—148; *PL*, CXLIX, 1453 and 1480). Guitmund's contemporary Lanfranc, who also wrote a *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini* against the teachings of Berengar, mentions in his chap. xix that 'facta sunt tam

Until the Berengarian controversy, they had been used only in works intended mainly for popular consumption, such as the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great and the *Vitae Patrum*[1], and they had been usually ignored by the serious theologians who had participated in the first quarrel over the doctrine of the Eucharist, precipitated by Radbert's treatise in the middle of the ninth century[2]. The more serious acceptance now accorded to miracle stories is due in large part to a reaction against the rejection of them by Berengar and his adherents — 'Gesta namque sanctorum Patrum protervo ore dilacerant' said Guitmund accusingly[3], and with his vigorous defense of the Eucharistic stories he set them before the public as proofs of the doctrine of the Real Presence which now bore the approval of a competent theologian. Naturally the influence of Guitmund alone would have made but little impression on the people and clergy in general had it not coincided with a development in the popular attitude toward the Eucharist in the first part of the twelfth century which made tales of miraculous occurrences particularly acceptable[4]. P. Browe believes that the reaction against the Albigensian and Waldensian heresies throughout the twelfth century was to a great extent responsible for the increasing frequency with which miracle

---

antiquis quam modernis temporibus, in diversis Ecclesiis huic fidei congrua miracula, quando, et ubi, et quibus tantum secretum demonstrare voluit aeterna sapientia . . . Quae miracula facta esse ignorat nullus quisquis in ecclesiasticis historiis, seu sanctorum Patrum gestis est aliquantulum studiosus' (*PL*, CL, 435). He does not, however, relate any specific cases. The occurrence of miracles is also cited as a proof of the 'veritas' of the Eucharist in the fourth part of a *Confessio fidei* which has sometimes been ascribed to Alcuin: 'Nemo quidem fidelium dubitare debet de tanti mysterii veritate, quae tam multis testimoniis probata est, et nonnunquam divina revelatione aliquibus manifestata est' (*PL*, CI, 1089). No stories are related, however. Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta* (Paris 1675), I, 178—219 [reprinted from the 1723 edition in *PL*, CI, 1003—1023], first attributed the *Confessio* to the time of Alcuin. His dating was rejected by Karl Werner, *Gerbert von Aurillac, die Kirche und Wissenschaft seiner Zeit*, 2d ed. (Wien 1881), pp. 147—149, who placed it in the early years of the eleventh century. Mabillon's view was revived by F. Cabrol, 'Les Ecrits liturgiques d'Alcuin, '*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, XIX (1923), 518, who did not, however, refute Werner's arguments in detail. The matter has been settled by J. Geiselmann, *Theologische Quartalschrift*, CV (1924), 272—295, who proves that Part IV of the *Confessio* is an anti-Berengarian tract, and therefore written after 1050. His conclusions are accepted by Macdonald, *op. cit.*, pp. 339—340.

[1] With, of course, the notable exception of Radbert's use of the 'Plecgils' story.

[2] The work of Gezo of Tortona discussed above hardly deserves to be called a serious treatise, since it is entirely unoriginal and is put together with little or no plan.

[3] Ed. Hurter, p. 146; *PL*, CXLIX, 1480.

[4] Cf. P. Browe, *Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter*, pp. 17—18, 27—28, 49, for the influence of the Berengarian heresy on the development of devotion to the Eucharist in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries.

stories appear in the French chronicles of the time[1]. The stories are very often introduced or concluded with the remark that the miracle took place in order that heretics might be confuted, and the faith of the people strengthened[2]. Schönbach has pointed out that the Christianization of the Germanic peoples was not entirely completed until that time, and that the great spread of miracle stories which then took place is attributable in considerable measure to the wish of the people for supplementary proofs of the dogmas which were being taught to them[3].

During the course of the twelfth century the development of the Eucharistic stories follows the growth and spread of the Mary legends, which were then beginning to be collected into groups, and were being copied repeatedly with constantly increasing additions[4]. The actual collections of Mary legends seem to have come into existence early in the century[5], after such an author as Petrus Damiani had begun to assemble small groups of them somewhat earlier[6]. The Eucharistic miracles which had been gathered together by Gezo, Petrus Damiani, and Durand of Troarn from the *Vitae Patrum*, Gregory of Tours, and Gregory the Great, were not incorporated into independent legendaries within the twelfth century, but they continued to be related with increasing frequency in saints' lives and chronicles, until Caesarius of Heisterbach, in 1223—1224, assembled a large number of them in the ninth 'Distinctio' of his *Dialogus Miraculorum*[7].

With the increase in the number of stories during the twelfth century there becomes discernible also a certain tendency to conform to general types. In the earlier centuries stories had had a more in-

[1] 'Die eucharistischen Verwandlungswunder des Mittelalters,' *Römische Quartalschrift*, XXXVII (1929), 167.

[2] Browe, *ibid.*, quotes Alanus ab Insulis, *Contra haereticos*, I, lxii: 'In horum haereticorum confusionem, in pluribus ecclesiis celebratur miraculum, quo in hostia species carnis visa est' (*PL*, CCX, 365).

[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 66—67. Guibert de Nogent (1053—1121) advised the use of exempla in sermons in his *Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debeat* (*PL*, CLVI, 21—32), according to J. T. Welter, *L'Exemplum dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du moyen âge* (Paris 1927), p. 35. Guibert himself inserted a Eucharistic story in his *De Pignoribus Sanctorum*, I, ii, describing the apparition of a child in the hands of a priest at the elevation, but the apparition was visible only to a child who happened to be standing near (*PL*, CLVI, 616—617).

[4] Cf. H. Günter, *Legenden-Studien*, pp. 176—178, on the process of accretion that took place in the growth of the legendaries.

[5] A. Mussafia, 'Studien zu den mittelalterlichen Marienlegenden, I,' *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Phil.-Hist. Kl.), CXIII (1886), 918, says that the earliest groups of Mary legends were assembled about that time.

[6] Karl Benrath, 'Zur Geschichte der Marienverehrung,' *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, LIX (1886), 217, claims that it was Damiani who introduced the vogue of the Mary miracles into western literature.

[7] For a recent discussion of Caesarius of Heisterbach, see Welter, *op. cit.*, pp. 113—118. Cf. below, p. 55, n. 5.

dividual quality, and the relatively restricted number of them was repeated over and over. Now they are mentioned in lists by chroniclers[1], or are told in a series in a saint's life[2]. The punishment of unworthy recipients, of doubters, and of desecrators continues as the most popular motif of the transformation stories. However, the 'reward' stories, in which a pious believer is granted a vision because of his holiness or his faith, and of which Radbert's 'Plecgils' had been the only instance in earlier centuries, now begin to appear with moderate frequency.

A characteristic difference in the nature of the apparitions begins to become noticeable too in the twelfth century. The appearance of mere flesh and blood not in the form of a human figure tends to become the special feature of the 'punishment' stories, while on the other hand, the appearance of a human figure now takes place most frequently in the 'reward' stories. This is a distinct departure from the old tradition of the 'Basil' and 'Arsenius' stories, in which a child was either torn apart in the hands of the celebrant or was cut into pieces by an angel. The barbarous trait seems to have been eliminated not solely because of its barbarity, however, but because in the 'reward' stories it would have been inappropriate to shock the pious communicant with the scene of dismemberment of the child; and in the 'punishment' stories it was more effective to have the host turn to bleeding flesh before the gaze of the unworthy recipient than merely to have him witness a sacrifice performed by an angel. It must be remembered, however, that there are many exceptions to these general tendencies, that both 'reward' and 'punishment' stories were occasionally told by the same author, and that no absolute line of division can be drawn where so much depends on the sense of appropriateness and the artistic gifts of the individual authors.

The 'punishment' stories have been studied in two articles by Browe. In the first he treats the numerous cases of desecration of the host by Jews and others[3]. These stories almost never involve the appearance of a human figure, but usually describe the transformation of the bread into flesh and the wine into blood. Browe shows that the desecration stories are evolved from stories of ritualistic murders and from accusations that the Jews mocked images of Christ during certain of their ceremonials. He finds one such story as early as Gregory of Tours[4], but except for instances directly imitated

---

[1] Welter, *op. cit.*, pp. 44—46, sketches the use of *exempla* in general in the chronicles of the twelfth century.

[2] As in the *Vita S. Elisabeth*, chap. iii, by Eckbert of Schönau (*PL*, CXCV, 140).

[3] 'Die Hostienschändungen der Juden im Mittelalter,' *Römische Quartalschrift*, XXXIV (1926), 167—197.

[4] *In Gloria martyrum*, chap. xxi (*M. G. H., SS. rer. Merov.*, I, 501). On these stories, see also H. Günter, *Die christliche Legende des Abendlandes*, p. 160.

from Gregory, the great number of them is found after the middle of the twelfth century[1].

A more interesting kind of 'punishment' story is that in which the host turns into flesh and blood in order to convince a doubter of the reality of the change at the time of consecration. Browe has studied some of these stories in his second article[2], but says (p. 140) that the stories in which a human figure appears are exceptional and that in most cases the host is represented as turning into bleeding flesh. He then gives (pp. 141—146) a long list of cases in which the transformed host was preserved and became the object of special devotions[3]. He claims[4] that the earliest example of the apparition of bleeding flesh is the case from the life of Gregory the Great, but the instances mentioned above from Gregory of Tours's *Historia Francorum* are considerably earlier[5].

The simplest stories are those related by such chroniclers as William of Malmesbury[6], Robert of Torigny[7], Giraldus Cambrensis (Gerald of Barry)[8], and the anonymous authors of the *Chronicon Vezeliacense*[9]

---

[1] Browe, *loc. cit.*, pp. 170—171. On pp. 173—175, he gives a comprehensive list of the various cases of such desecrations mentioned in chronicles and annals down to about 1500.

[2] 'Die eucharistischen Verwandlungswunder des Mittelalters,' *Römische Quartalschrift*, XXXVII (1929), 137—169. On the 'punishment' stories, see especially pp. 161—164.

[3] This type of miracle is the main topic of Browe's article.

[4] *Loc. cit.*, p. 137, n. 1.

[5] Cf. above, p. 19, n. 4.

[6] In his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, III, § 286 (ed. Stubbs, II, 341—342) and *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* (quoted below, p. 50, n. 1). Cf. above, p. 31.

[7] In his continuation of the chronicle of Sigebert, Robert of Torigny (or Robert de Monte), ed. Howlett (London 1889: 'Rolls Series, No. 82, Vol. IV'), pp. 296—297, lists half a dozen cases in his entry for the years 1181—1182. Most of them are punishment stories and are very briefly told. The following is a typical case: 'Similiter evenit in Andegavensi civitate, cum quidam sacerdos cantaret missam, puer parvulus intererat missae, et vidit idem puer puerum parvum pulcherrimum in manu sacerdotis sacrantis corpus Domini; qui protinus exivit foras ecclesiam, clamans omnibus quos invenit, et dicens: "Venite et videte mirabilia Dei", et intrantes in ecclesiam nihil viderunt praeter speciem panis.' The similarity of this case to the one related by Guibert de Nogent in his *De Pignoribus Sanctorum*, I, ii, is striking. D'Achéry, in the note to this passage in his edition of the works of Guibert (reprinted in *PL*, CLVI, 1026), has also noticed this resemblance. Cf. above, p. 46.

[8] Giraldus lists both old and contemporary miracles indiscriminately in his *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, I, xi, ed. J. S. Brewer (London 1862: 'Rolls Series, No. 21, Vol. II'), pp. 38—43. He cites the case of Gregory and the doubting woman, and then three from contemporary history. He gives special emphasis to the story of Basil and the Jew, following almost exactly the words of the *Vitae Patrum*. Then follow a contemporary 'punishment' story; an attack on the Albigensians (or *Cathari*); the citation of a letter of Pope Alexander III on a miracle supposed to have happened at Amiens; a variant on the story of the bees who build a shrine of wax about a host which had been placed in a hollow tree. This story had been first related

and the *Libellus de Revelatione* of Fécamp[1]. These authors frequently say that the miracles took place as a demonstration that the heretical doctrines current at the time were false. They mention the stories only briefly, but often they provide information as to the place and date of the occurrence. They mix various types of stories in the same chapter or sentence, and give none but the barest descriptions of the circumstances. One of the reasons that they could give so few details concerning the events they mention is that such events, or the news of such events, were within the experience of most of their readers.

The saints' lives of the twelfth century show frequent instances of Eucharistic miracles in which the saint may bring about a miracle to convince doubters, as Gregory the Great was supposed to have done; or, the miracle may be granted to the saint because of his great holiness. Here again the two main types of 'punishment' (or 'conversion') and 'reward' stories are clearly apparent. As an instance of the first type of story we may cite the case in the life of Odo of Canterbury. This biography is of uncertain date and authorship, but it was probably written during the late eleventh century or in the first years of the twelfth[2]. When certain misguided clerics asserted

---

by Peter the Venerable of Cluny in his *De Miraculis*, I, i (*PL*, CLXXXIX, 851—853), on which cf. P. Browe, 'Die Eucharistie als Zaubermittel im Mittelalter,' *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XX (1930), 138, n. 6.

[9] The entry for the year 1116 in the *Chronicon Vezeliacense* is: 'Willelmus Nivernensis Comes apud Avalum captus est. In Dolensi Coenobio cuidam Monacho Missas agenti apparuit puer super altare loco hostiae ante calicem.' Reprinted from Labbe, *Nova Bibliotheca MSS*, I, 396, in Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, XII (Paris 1781), 344.

[1] This chronicle of the abbey of Fécamp relates in chap. xvi that a 'Sacerdos enim quidam nomine Isaac, cum finitis orationibus sacrosancta sacramenta Dominici corporis et sanguinis assumere deberet, substantiam corporis et sanguinis, non panis, aut vini specie reperit coopertam, sed evidentissime carnis et sanguinis colorem et qualitatem protendentem' (*PL*, CLI, 717). The same miracle is included in the list given by Robert of Torigny, cited above. A priest named Isaac is also mentioned in a Eucharistic miracle described by Reiner of Liége in his *Vita S. Tiebaldi*, I, iii: 'viderit aliquando super altare veri Isaac sacramentum in formam pueri pendentis in cruce illique arridentis transformatum' (*PL*, CCIV, 73—74).

[2] Mabillon (reprinted *PL*, CXXXIII, 931—934) attributes this life to a monk Osbern of Canterbury, a contemporary of Lanfranc. But Potthast, *Bibliotheca Historica Medii Aevi* (Berlin 1896), II, 1499, ascribes it to Eadmer. Manitius, III, 581—584, does not mention it in his treatment of Eadmer. Odo was Archbishop of Canterbury in the middle of the tenth century (Manitius, II, 497), but this biography was certainly not contemporary with him. Macdonald's use of this story (*op. cit.*, pp. 246—247) to show that in the tenth century 'the view was widely held among the Saxon clergy that consecration did not change the substance of bread and wine' is hardly justifiable because of the very doubtful time of composition of the *Vita Odonis*. Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta*, I, 206—207 (reprinted in *PL*, CI, 1017), had accepted the passage as proving the exact opposite: 'enormis perfidia errorque censebatur, si quis de corporis Christi Domini in Eucharistia veritate dubitasset.'

that the substance of bread and wine remained in the Eucharist after the consecration, Odo decided to change their opinions by a miracle[1]. He prayed and

cumque ad confractionem vivifici panis ventum fuisset . . . confestim namque inter manus pontificis, fragmenta corporis Christi tenentis, sanguis guttatim defluere coepit. Stans itaque pontifex . . . innuit astantibus ministris ut illi potissimum propius accedant qui nuper in fide titubaverant. [When the doubters had been convinced] oravit ergo sacerdos; post orationem ad aram respexit, et ubi dimiserat sanguinem, consuetam vini reperit speciem.

The imitation of the episode in the life of Gregory is quite clear[2].

The same episode was directly referred to, but changed in some of the principal details in a sermon against the Albigensians by Eckbert of Schönau[3]:

Tempore Gregorii papae, qui cum oraret pro infidelitate populi et inter missarum solemnia secundum consuetudinem obtulisset super altare Dei panem et vinum, et solitas benedictiones fecisset, hoc precibus a Deo obtinuit, ut appareret ibi caro Dominica sicuti erat, et ostenderetur his qui aderant in specie carnis, quae prius illic fuerat in specie panis, sicque liberatus est populus ab infidelitate hac.

A comparatively long and diffusely told tale in the life of Hugh of Lincoln shows an independent development of the punishment motif which follows the model set by Petrus Damiani, in which an

---

[1] *PL*, CXXXIII, 939. This story is also told by William of Malmesbury in his *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton (London 1870: 'Rolls Series, No. 52'), p. 25: 'Plerosque de veritate Dominici corporis dubitantes ita roboravit, ut panem altaris versum in carnem, vinum calicis in sanguinem, propalam ostenderet, et denuo in genuinam spetiem retorta, usui humano conducibilia faceret.' William probably does not depend on the life by Osbern (or Eadmer), since the latter mentions only the appearance of blood, not of flesh. Mabillon (*PL*, CXXXIII, 931) has pointed out other discrepancies between the account of Odo in William's *Gesta Pontificum* and the life by Osbern.

[2] Saint Brendan also is able to convince Gildas by means of a miracle: 'Et cepit missam cantare. Venitque ipse sanctissimus senex Gylldas cum suis fratribus accipere eucaristiam de manu sancti Brendani. Viditque sanctus Gilldas carnem crudam in disco et sanguinem in calice . . . Iterum orante sancto Brendano, Corpus Dominicum in specie consuetudinaria in disco apparuit, et sanguis in calice in vinum.' This passage is in a *Vita S. Brendani* preserved in a Dublin MS, which has been published in *Analecta Bollandiana*, XLVIII (1930), 112, by P. Grosjean.

[3] *Sermones contra Catharos*, XI, xvi (*PL*, CXCV, 93–94). Schönbach, *loc. cit.*, p. 59, says that he had some hesitation in accepting this as the story from the *Vita Gregorii* concerning the doubting woman, but since he could find no better source for it, he was forced to believe that Eckbert had merely transformed the old story to suit his own needs. There is no particular reason why he should not have done so. The example cited above from the life of Odo of Canterbury is an example of an even more radical reworking of the old story. Schönbach does not cite the miracle of Odo at all.

unbelieving priest, or one unworthy to celebrate Mass, is punished[1]. A certain priest related to Hugh that, after he had committed a great sin,

ad sacri altaris ministerium impudens et temerarius accedere consuevi . . . perventum est ad hoc, ut frangenda esset trifaria, more debito, hostia sacrosancta. Quam ut per medium fregi, mox cruor liquidissimus per fracturam effluere coepit; qui mediam hostiae partem, quam manu tenebam, in carnis speciem subito conversam, rubore sanguineo infecit[2].

The other 'punishment' stories of the twelfth century show no essential modification of these characteristics.

The saints' lives of the twelfth century also abound in 'reward' stories, and it is in this type particularly that we begin to see traits which will reappear in the early thirteenth century in the vision of King Arthur at Saint Austin's Chapel in the *Perlesvaus*. No one story contains all the elements which are to be found in the *Perlesvaus* scene, but this is only natural, since the author of the *Perlesvaus* probably followed no direct written source. He could not have failed to know many Eucharistic vision stories, and in this scene as in so many others in his romance, he wove together elements remembered from dozens of sources[3]. Every single element in the scene can be parallelled in earlier vision scenes, granted as rewards to the saints of the twelfth century or at least described by writers of the twelfth century following in the tradition of Gregory the Great, Radbert, Guitmund, and others. A few of the many scenes that are current in saints' lives of this period will be sketched briefly here to show the wealth of material at hand for the author of the *Perlesvaus* to use[4]. No effort is here made to describe all the scenes that are extant in twelfth century works; but those which show traits similar to the *Perlesvaus* will be indicated.

---

[1] Cf. above, p. 39.

[2] *Magna Vita S. Hugonis episcopi Lincolniensis*, V, iv, ed. J. F. Dimock (London 1864: 'Rolls Series, No. 37'), pp. 242—245. Also in *PL*, CLIII, 1040—1042.

[3] Cf. Nitze's thorough discussion of this characteristic of the literary method of the author of the *Perlesvaus*, *op. cit.*, II, 157—170.

[4] A heterogeneous collection of miracles in saints' lives of various centuries, classified according to motifs, has been published by Peter Toldo in a series of articles under the general title 'Leben und Wunder der Heiligen im Mittelalter', in the *Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte*, I, II, IV, V, VI, VIII, IX (1901—1909). The sections which contain occasional mentions of Eucharistic miracles are: 'VI. Himmlische Visionen,' IV (1904), 49—77, and 'XII. Umgestaltungen. Verwandlungen,' V (1905), 343—353. Practically all the saints' lives cited by Toldo are in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, but he gives no page references and does not cite his examples in chronological order. The introduction to this series of articles was published in the *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, XIV (1901), 267—288. Although Toldo's material is very difficult to control, his articles succeed in giving a general — if somewhat confused — picture of the various kinds of miracles related in saints' lives throughout the Middle Ages.

Aelred of Rievaux in his life of Edward the Confessor relates that one time when Edward was at Mass accompanied by his faithful retainer Leofric, both of them saw Christ appear on the altar, raise his right hand, and bless Edward[1]:

Agitur in altari coeleste mysterium, manibus sacerdotis divina sacramenta tractantur. Et ecce . . . Jesus Christus in ara consistens, oculis utriusque visibiliter corporalibus apparuit, sacraque dextera super regem extensa, signum sanctae crucis eum benedicendo depinxit. At rex, demisso capite, divinae adorabat praesentiam majestatis.

This story is particularly significant since it relates a vision seen by a King of England, and one who in many ways must have exemplified by his life of piety the model from which Arthur had strayed, according to the opening lines of the *Perlesvaus* (84—95). Furthermore, in the *Perlesvaus* Arthur is presented as having been won back to a better life by the vision he saw (565—566). This may, to some extent, be seen as a parallel to the blessing given to Edward by the figure which appeared in the vision. It is particularly striking in this story that there is no mention of the Eucharistic bread and wine, though the vision is obviously associated with the time of consecration in the words 'manibus sacerdotis divina sacramenta tractantur'. The *Perlesvaus* scene also fails to mention the bread and wine, but is even more clearly associated with the Eucharistic ceremony.

In the life of Hugh of Lincoln mentioned above, there is a 'reward' story in which a cleric sees a child in the hands of Hugh at the moment of the elevation[2]:

Cumque, caeteris jam rite peractis, ad eum pervenisset locum, ubi elevatam in altum hostiam benedicere moris est . . . cujusdam clerici oculos superna clementia dignata est aperire; eique sub specie infantis parvuli, Christum suum demonstravit mundissimis digitis sacri praesulis reverentissime contrectari. Erat vero idem puer forma quidem permodicus, sed divino quodam nitore atque candore super aestimationem hominis nimium decorus.

Like Arthur, the cleric weeps at the sight, and continues to do so until he sees the child again: 'tempus omne continuabat in lacrymis, quod intercessit ab illa elevatione usquequo iterum eum levari cerneret . . . In qua rursum elevatione, sub eadem [qua] prius imagine, natum intuetur de virgine Filium Altissimi[3]'.

The fact that Arthur saw the Eucharistic apparition in the form of a crucified figure as well as of a child is also to be parallelled in

[1] *PL*, CXCV, 760. The vision probably appeared to Edward in the form of a full grown man; otherwise the phrase 'divinae adorabat praesentiam majestatis' would hardly be appropriate.

[2] *Vita Hugonis*, V, iii (ed. Dimock, pp. 235—236).

[3] Cf. *Perlesvaus*, 318—319: 'Li rois a pitié en son cuer de ce qu'il a veü, e l'en vindrent les lermes as ielz.'

twelfth century saints' lives. This trait is not frequent in the early centuries, and almost the only instance of it is the case cited above from Gezo of Tortona[1]. However, in the twelfth century 'reward' stories it begins to appear with some degree of frequency, as in the story related by Reiner of Liége in his *Vita S. Tiebaldi*, I, iii. St. Thibaut is supposed to have seen 'super altare veri Isaac [the celebrating priest] sacramentum in formam pueri pendentis in cruce illique arridentis transformatum[2]'. In another of his works, the *Lacrymae*, III, iii, Reiner relates a similar vision which was seen by a monk whose name he does not mention ('quam didici nostro cuidam aliquando familiari accidisse'). In this vision the priest sees a boy hanging on a cross, from whose side blood and water drip into the chalice. At the Lord's Prayer the vision suddenly changes and he sees the same child seated on a throne in glory[3]. A new element is introduced in this story, or rather a new interpretation is given to an old motif. The old transformation of the host into flesh and blood or into a human figure, and then back again to the appearance of bread, is here elaborated and adapted in such a way that the bread first changes to a crucified figure, which in turn becomes a glorified apparition of Christ seated on a throne[4]. The element of a shift in the vision had been present in a crude form in the 'Basil' and 'Arsenius' stories where the unbeliever first saw a child, witnessed the sacrificing of it, and then received a piece of its flesh. But the old stories were completely unsuitable as 'reward' visions, and this new type of change was introduced in the twelfth century stories to meet the new needs. This element of successive transformations of the vision is one of the outstanding characteristics of the *Perlesvaus* scene, for Arthur sees first the child, then the crucified figure, and again the child.

The *Perlesvaus* vision has an elaborate setting in which the Virgin appears holding the child at the beginning of the Mass, and departs with him at the end. This trait which occurred very rarely in the early stories[5], is introduced in a miracle story related by Peter the Venerable, of Cluny. On New Year's Day a venerable priest named Gerard began to say Mass, and 'vestibus sacris exterius paratus . . . ad altare accessit'. During the Canon, and after he had pronounced the words of consecration, he cast his glance just before the Lord's

---

[1] Cf. above, p. 36.

[2] *PL*, CCIV, 73–74.

[3] *PL*, CCIV, 174: 'dum corpus et sanguinem jam consecrasset Dominicum, repente modo . . . tam spiritualibus quam corporalibus oculis coram se vidit puerum in cruce pendentem, de cujus latere ac si vulnerato stillarent sanguis et aqua in calicem. Dum vero ad Dominicam venisset orationem, visione subito immutata eumdem puerum non jam in cruce pendere, sed in solio contemplatus est majestatis residere.'

[4] Compare the trait in the *Perlesvaus*, 296–297: 'la dame prist son fil e ala seoir a la destre partie vers l'autel, desus une chaiere molt riche'.

[5] The story of the Jewish child saved from the furnace, where the Virgin was really the principal figure, is practically the only example.

Prayer upon the bread and wine. He saw instead of bread, however, a small boy 'manibus et brachiis more infantiae gestientem'[1]. Peter here interrupts his narrative to say that he has read of other similar occurrences, but that in the case of Gerard another element was added which rendered it quite different from all others:

> Nam dum hoc stupidus miraretur, convertens oculos ad latus altaris, conspicit mulierem honestissimae formae, et ut intellectu conceperat, beatam semper virginem ejusdem Dei pueruli matrem, diligenti eum et velut materna custodia multa cum reverentia observantem.

The presence of the Virgin at the side of the altar, looking at the child 'velut materna custodia multa cum reverentia observantem,' has a remarkable parallel in the *Perlesvaus* scene, where the Virgin holds the child and sits at the side of the altar[2]. Gerard also sees standing beside the Virgin an angel who says to him 'miraris? hic puer quem conspicis, coelum gubernat et terram.' Even this phrase has its parallel in the phrase uttered by the Virgin in the *Perlesvaus* where she says to the child: 'Sire . . . vos estes mes pere, e mes filz, e mes sire, e garde de moi e de toz' (298—299). The angel who stands beside her and speaks to Gerard also has his counterpart in the *Perlesvaus*: for Arthur hears the responses of angels as the hermit sings the Mass (305—306); when the Mass is finished 'la voiz d'un saint angle dist: *Ite missa est*' (321—322); and when the mother and child depart in the *Perlesvaus* they disappear with 'la graigneur conpeignie e a la plus bele que nus eüst onques veüe' (322—323). The story of Gerard continues with the disappearance of the vision of the mother, child, and angel[3]. When Gerard turns his eyes back toward the altar 'infantem jam videre non potuit. Sed panis speciem ut prius fuerat, altari superimpositam vidit.'

Although the Eucharistic stories usually represent the transformation of the species as taking place during a Mass, it is noticeable that most of them do not refer to specific parts of the Mass, other than to allude in a general way to the consecration or the communion. Peter the Venerable, however, is more specific, and mentions the putting on of the vestments, the *Introit*, the Canon, the consecration, and, after the vision, the finishing of the Mass[4]. The author of the *Perlesvaus* also mentions the vesting of the priest[5], the *Confiteor*,

---

[1] *De Miraculis*, I, viii (*PL*, CLXXXIX, 865—866).

[2] *Perlesvaus*, 296—298: 'la dame prist son fil e ala seoir a la destre partie vers l'autel, desus une chaiere molt riche, e mist son fill desus ses genoz e le commença a besier molt docement.'

[3] The vision of the crucified figure disappears also from Arthur's sight: 'E qant il l'a tant esgardé, si ne set que il devient' (317—318).

[4] 'More suo vestibus sacris exterius paratus . . . ad altare accessit. Cumque caeteris expletis ad Canonem pervenisset, et verba divina . . . paululum ante Dominicam orationem . . . missam supernae gratiae muneribus donatam ille Dei presbyter consummavit' (*PL*, CLXXXIX, 865—866).

[5] *Perlesvaus*, 284—285: 'e li sanble que li hermites soit apareilliez por chanter la messe.' Note also the variant to line 290 from MSS *Be* and *Br*.

the *Introit*, the reading of the gospel, the Offertory[1], the beginning of the Canon[2], the preface, and the *Ite missa est* (321—322).

It requires no great effort of the imagination to believe that the author of the *Perlesvaus*, with his pronounced Cluniac sympathies[3], may at some time have read the above passage in the *De Miraculis*, the work of one of the greatest of Cluny's abbots. He does not reproduce it exactly by any means, and he leaves out some elements that might seem essential in any Eucharistic miracle, such as the mention of the bread and wine. Certainly he did not follow the story by Peter the Venerable in the same way that he might have used a written source. He was working from memory, possibly with no consciousness of his indebtedness to Peter at all, and was building up a scene of his own from elements that were now part of the long tradition of Eucharistic stories[4]. The tradition had begun before Constantine in the simple allusions of Cyprian; it had been developed by Gregory the Great and the authors of the *Vitae Patrum* for purposes of popular edification; had later been adopted by Radbert and Guitmund as a serious proof of the Real Presence; and was finally handed on by the chroniclers and hagiographers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries to the compilers of the legendaries and miracle books, of which Peter the Venerable's was one of the first[5].

---

[1] *Perlesvaus*, 295—296: 'Qant li sainz hermites ot dit son Confiteor, il ala a l'autel;' and 306—308: 'qant li sainz Evangiles fu liz . . . la dame prist son enfant e l'ofri as mains au saint ermite.' Note the repetition of the words 'ofert,' 'ofrande,' 'ofrir' in the passage 308—312.

[2] The phrase 'aprés commença son sacrement' (312—313) must refer to the beginning of the Canon and not to the consecration proper, because it is followed by the mention of the Preface (315), which always precedes the consecration.

[3] Nitze, *op. cit.*, II, 86—88, shows that the *Perlesvaus* was conceived and executed in a spirit which harmonizes as strikingly with Cluny as that of the *Queste* does with Cîteaux.

[4] Even the element of the ray of light which shines on the altar during the Mass has many parallels, specifically associated with the Eucharist in the case of St. Martin of Tours, over whose head there appears a 'globus igneus, dum sacramenta corporis et sanguinis Domini in ecclesia offerret' (quoted by Eckbert of Schönau in his *Sermones contra Catharos*, XI, xvi [*PL*, CXCV, 93—94]; and also in the twelfth century, by Honorius Augustodunensis in his *Speculum Ecclesiae* [*PL*, CLXXII, 1023—1024]). The mysterious light is also mentioned in an interesting passage in the *Vita Sanctae Aldegundis* by Hucbaldus of St. Amand: 'Sacerdos quidam . . . referre solebat, noctu se vidisse globum igneum descendisse de coelo super habitaculum, in quo famula Christi [i. e. St. Aldegundis] aegrotabat' (*PL*, CXXXII, 874; cf. also 869 and 875). A similar trait occurs in the *Perlesvaus* in the description of the Grail Castle 'la sainte chapele que vos verroiz aparoir eu chastel, la ou la flanbe dou Saint Esprit descent chascun jor por le saintisme Graal et por la sainte lance donc la pointe saigne que l'on i sert' (2275—2277). For the frequency of the motif of mysterious light, see further, Günter, *Legenden-Studien*, p. 190, *s. v.* 'Lichtglanz.'

[5] A similar book, but one which contains even more miracles of the Eucharist, was compiled about 1178 by a Cistercian monk named Herbert, who later became Archbishop of Torres in Sardinia (cf. Welter, *op. cit.*,

The author of the *Perlesvaus*, with the scene described by Peter vaguely in his memory, and with other scenes half-remembered from the numerous similar stories which he must have known, has put together by the medieval process of *expolitio* a number of traditional elements, not one of which is new, to make an episode which admirably fulfils its own particular artistic function within his work. It sets the tone of the rest of the romance, which will show Arthur, inspired by his Eucharistic vision at the beginning, as the protagonist in a story of the advancement of Christianity.

---

p. 43). It is interesting to note that Herbert groups together in two parts of his work the Eucharistic miracles which he relates: Book I contains apparitions of a child on the altar in chaps. iii, xix, xx, xxi; while Book III describes only the appearance of flesh and blood (not in human form), in chaps. xx, xxi, xxii, xxviii, xxix: and contains simple 'punishment' stories in chaps. xxiii, xxiv, and xxvii (*PL*, CLXXXV, 1280, 1296—1298, 1370—1374). In the ninth 'Distinctio' of his *Dialogus Miraculorum*, Caesarius of Heisterbach also groups a large number of Eucharistic stories, of which one (chap. iii., ed. J. Strange [Cologne 1851], II, 169) has been cited as showing successive changes in the Eucharistic vision, by J. N. Carman, *The Relationship of the Perlesvaus and the Queste del Saint Graal* (Chicago 1936), p. 36, n. 9. However, since the *Perlesvaus* was written before 1212 (cf. Nitze, *op. cit.*, II, 89), Carman cites the case in Caesarius merely as an analogue.

WILLIAM ROACH.